



AC 8 .L53 1000 v.3
Lindsley, Philip, 1786-1855.
The works of Philip Lindsley
..

AC 8 .L53 1000 v.3







Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

<https://archive.org/details/worksofphiliplin03lind>

WORKS OF
PHILIP LINDSLEY, D.D.



Fac Simile of the Authors hand writing being the first page of his Address on the Centennial Birthday of Washington delivered at Nashville February 22^d 1832

A century has now elapsed since the birth of our immortal Washington. And ten millions of freemen can this day testify that a republic is not always ungrateful to her noblest benefactor. With what thrilling emotions have we not listened again to his last paternal counsels, and yielded the conviction of honest hearts to the truth & wisdom of all his sagacious & ever seasonable instructions! Such a farewell address was worthy of the father of his country. It is itself an invaluable legacy to the latest generations—where liberty, integrity, the rights of man, the principles of universal equity, the calm pursuits of unambitious peaceful tranquillity, the steady progressive advancement of the human species in virtue, intelligence & happiness shall be duly appreciated, & honoured. Nor can a

more appropriate tribute of respect be offered to his memory, than the solemn recital, in the ears of the people, on each returning anniversary of his birth-day, of this precious valedictory. It is a text-book for our statesmen to study - and it may serve as an infallible test in the hands of the people, by which to try the spirit & character of their rulers & of all political aspirants. Let every youth commit it to memory. Let its maxims be engraven upon every American heart. It will enlighten his judgment, enlarge his conceptions, elevate & chasten his patriotism, subdue his sectional & selfish prejudices, expand his bosom with a generous philanthropy, & lead him to esteem all the citizens of every state as his brethren, and as equally entitled to all the franchises, privileges & blessings which our common constitution & representative government were designed to secure and to perpetuate.



THE
WORKS
OF
✓
PHILIP LINDSLEY, D.D.,

FORMERLY VICE-PRESIDENT AND PRESIDENT ELECT OF THE COLLEGE OF
NEW JERSEY, PRINCETON; AND LATE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.

EDITED BY
LE ROY J. HALSEY, D.D.

PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE NORTHWEST.

WITH INTRODUCTORY NOTICES OF HIS LIFE AND LABOURS.

BY THE EDITOR.

"He was a scholar, and a ripe and good one."

VOLUME III.

MISCELLANEOUS DISCOURSES AND ESSAYS.

PHILADELPHIA:
J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO.
1866.

Entered, according to act of Congress, in the year 1864, by

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO.,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern
District of Pennsylvania.

CONTENTS OF VOL. III.

	PAGE
I.	
Supplementary Biographical Sketch of the Author, by the Editor.	9
II.	
The Primitive State of Mankind: an Attempt to Prove that the Original or most Ancient Condition of the Human Family was Civilized and not Savage.....	81
III.	
The Primitive State of Mankind, concluded	112
IV.	
The Aborigines of North America.....	153
V.	
Religious Prejudices.....	191
VI.	
Address on the Occasion of the Centennial Birthday of George Washington	229
VII.	
American Democracy:	
PART I.—Address to Farmers and Mechanics.....	265
II.—The Federal Constitution.....	317
III.—What can the Government do for the People?.....	354
IV.—Tariff, Taxation, Bounties, Free Trade, Revenue, Protection	376
V.—What can the People do for Themselves?.....	394

VIII.

	PAGE
Thoughts on Presbyterian Church Government; or, Ecclesiastical Polity	399

IX.

The Necessity of Circulating the Bible.....	459
---	-----

X.

The Claims of the Bible. An Address before the Bible Society.....	479
---	-----

XI.

Vindication of the Temperance Cause.....	505
--	-----

XII.

Miscellaneous Essays.

Banks—Brokers—Usury.....	545
Maxims, Sophisms, Dogmas, Fallacies, Themes, Nothings, Suggestions.....	553
Negro Slavery in America	574
Free Banks—State Stock Banks.....	584
Riches—Poverty.....	589
The Whistle.....	602
Genteel Beggars.....	607
The Seasons.....	613
Punch and a Bishop.....	616
Christmas	619
The American is a Spitting Animal.....	623
The Weather and Sundries.....	626
Nashville: by a Kentuckian.....	631
A Hint to the Easterns.....	636
Printers' Blunders.....	639
Horrid Robbery and Murder.....	643
A Prodigious Prediction.....	647
Reminiscences of Rev. Samuel Stanhope Smith, D.D., LL.D.....	652
Thoughts on Slavery.....	663

A SUPPLEMENTARY BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH
OF THE AUTHOR.

INTRODUCTION TO VOL. III.

A SUPPLEMENTARY BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR.

BY THE EDITOR.

No full and connected biography of Dr. Lindsley has been attempted in these volumes. The life of a student and man of letters is, for the most part, an uneventful one—at least uneventful as to single outward acts of public and general interest. In the present instance it has been thought that the best memoir, as well as the most lasting monument of the author, is to be found in his writings—not in what others may say of him, now that he is gone, but in what his own living pen had left on record. The words of such a man are his deeds, and when these are fully laid before the reader, but little remains to the biographer. Under this impression, all that has been aimed at in these introductory notices has been to present a fair estimate of his labours and influence in those fields to which his energies were devoted, and to furnish only so much, in the way of fact and incident, as might be needful to a right appreciation both of his writings and his character.

There is indeed no lack of materials for a full and even minute account of his life and labours. He seems, from a very early period, to have studied with pen in hand, and to the close of life to have kept a record of all his most important movements. Though there are frequent indications in his private journals that he had, from time to time, destroyed many manuscripts, still enough remains to furnish the amplest materials for a full and circumstantial biography, even aside from the accumulated and carefully preserved letters of his correspondents, during a period of forty-five years. But as it has been our

purpose, in connection with his Educational Discourses, to give some account of his work as an educator, and also some estimate of his character as a preacher, in connection with his Religious Discourses, so now, answering to the miscellaneous nature of this third volume, we shall aim simply to bring forward some other points in his history, which seem necessary to complete the picture, and to give the reader as distinct a view as possible of his whole life, labour, and influence. Even here, however, the story will be told, as far as possible, in his own words, derived from records which, while penned with much care and deliberation, were evidently never intended for the eye of the public, but simply for the satisfaction and instruction of his children. The life and character of every good man, especially of every eminently useful man, ought to be regarded, not as a private, but a public heritage. So far as the public may be interested in it and benefited by it, it may be properly made known, even where the individual had no such intention himself. It is with this view that the present supplementary memoir of Dr. Lindsley is now offered to the readers of his works.

I. HIS EARLY STUDIES.

It is always interesting to trace back to their earliest beginnings the influences which have resulted in a life of eminent usefulness. It affords a pleasure akin to that which a traveller feels in standing at the well-spring, high up in the mountains, of some beautiful and mighty river, whose banks he had been long and slowly ascending across half a continent. We have already given, in another place, a brief running narrative of the prominent events of Dr. Lindsley's life from its opening to its close. And the reader of these volumes, like the traveller, will perhaps readily respond to the feeling just suggested, on finding here, under his own hand, a record of the recollections and associations of that beginning. It is in the following words:—

“I was born at the home of my maternal grandmother, about three and a half miles southwest of Morristown, New Jersey. My parents removed to their new dwelling while I was an infant. Of course all

my childish recollections and associations are of, and with, the house and scenery of this my happy home. Oh! how I loved my grandfather, my father, my two grandmothers, and my ever-blessed mother! The only misery that I ever knew, during my younger years, was caused by separation from my loved mother, when at boarding-school. To see her—to sit by her—to listen to her voice—to share her smiles and caresses—was all that my heart coveted. With her I was as happy as I could be. When absent, I used to count the weary days and nights to be endured before I could see her. Time then seemed to have no wings. Why do mothers ever suffer their fond, delicate little ones to go from home, to be entrusted to strangers, mercenary, perhaps heartless and repulsive? After all, my mother was incomparably my ablest teacher. In consequence of there being no good school in my father's neighbourhood, I was sent away, when a little child, just beginning to spell the first lessons in Dilworth, to board among strangers, and to *rough* it among rude boys. I had a hard time of it. It pains me to think of it even now.

“After three months' absence, I returned to my happy home. I was again sent to a boarding-school for a few months—though I used to come home on Saturdays, and remain until Monday morning. This was not so severe a trial as the first. With the above exceptions, I lived at home, and went to school at New Vernon, about a mile from my father's residence, until I began, in my thirteenth year, to attend the classical academy of the Rev. Robert Finley, at Baskingridge.

“The country about my father's residence was singularly beautiful, variegated, and picturesque. The most lovely and striking scenery was ever in view; and I greatly enjoyed it. I have seldom since been equally impressed with the natural localities of any portion of our country with which I am acquainted. I was, like most lads, fond of hunting, fishing, skating and other rural sports—though these never interfered with my studies. I always loved books and intelligent people. I eagerly read history, biography, voyages, travels—everything which I could get hold of. I read the Bible (the gift of my mother) through, long before I went to Mr. Finley's school. I soon

learned by heart the catechism, and various hymns, etc. These I repeated to my mother, again and again. She taught me to pray before I could read. And I dared not go to sleep without repeating 'Our Father,' and 'Now I lay me down to sleep,' etc.

"At school I generally got the premium or prize, for being at the head of my class, (a little book or penknife,) and the pleasure it seemed to afford my mother was my chief reward. While at home, I read, among other books, the whole of Rollin's *Ancient History*. This I procured, by riding on horseback ten miles, of an uncle, who loaned me one volume at a time, and who questioned me about the contents, and closely inspected each returned volume, to see that I had not injured or soiled it. Thus, in due time, I got through the ten volumes. My delight in reading it was unbounded—and yet, I then knew nothing of geography.

"It was in the autumn of 1799 that I began to go to school to Mr. Finley. He commenced teaching soon after his marriage. I was one of his first six pupils, and was present on the first day. He taught a year in his own house. I boarded with him. He was one of the best teachers I have ever known. His school obtained great celebrity. Here, on the first day of my entering the school, I began the study of Latin. I continued at Mr. Finley's Academy, as it was called, three years, with the exception of three months (one winter) at Morristown, under the tuition of Mr. James Stevenson, also a distinguished teacher. After the first year, Mr. Finley employed an usher, or assistant, built a school-house, etc. He devoted several hours daily to the school, during the whole period of its continuance; that is, until he resigned his pastoral charge in 1817—having been appointed President of the University of Georgia. Thither he went, and there he died October third of the same year. The degree of D.D. had been conferred on him by the College of New Jersey in April of that year. I was then a Professor in the College, and Secretary of the Board of Trustees."

The fullest account we find of his early classical studies and his first attempts at teaching is in a letter (copied into one of his manuscript volumes) addressed to Rev. P. E. Stevenson, of Wyoming, Pennsyl-

vania, son of the gentleman mentioned in the preceding extract. It is under date of New Albany, Indiana, June 23d, 1853, and is in answer to a letter from Mr. Stevenson, who had requested him to furnish some reminiscences of his father. The whole letter is one of great interest, alike honourable to the character of the preceptor and the heart of the pupil. We give here some extracts bearing on the matter of his studies, and incipient labours as an educator. Speaking of Mr. Finley's Academy, he says:—

“I used to walk to school from home (a distance of three miles) during the summer, or rather during all the year except the *real* winter season. I was connected with said school three years, excepting one winter, that of 1801–2, which I passed at your father's Academy in Morristown. While there, (at your father's Academy,) among other things, I read several books of Homer's Iliad. In the spring I returned to Baskingridge. At the close of three years, *we*, that is myself and classmates, (Samuel L. Southard, Theodore Frelinghuysen, and Jacob Kirkpatrick, now D.D.,) entered the Junior Class at Princeton, namely, in November, 1802.

“Immediately after graduation in 1804, Mr. Stevenson came to my father's to engage me to assist him in the English department of his school—then kept in his own house on Bridge Street. His Academy had been burnt down some time before. I was not eighteen years old by some three months, and had an awful dread of the *magisterial* dignity thus pressed upon me. He offered me board in his family, and to teach me French, as compensation. I was perfectly satisfied with the terms, and only feared lest I should fail to meet his expectations. Thus in October or November, 1804, I began to *work*. At the close of the quarter or session, (about the middle or end of March, I think,) Mr. Stevenson very kindly expressed his obligations, with his regrets that he could not do for me more than our contract implied—and at the same time handed me a ten-dollar bank-bill! This last was wholly unexpected, and, as I felt, undeserved. It was my first earning: and did more (with his gracious words and manner) to encourage me to *go ahead* and to rely on myself, than all other influences and considerations combined.

“In the April following (1805) I began to serve as usher or assistant in the school of Mr. Finley, at a salary of \$300, without board. There I continued two years. I spent the summer of 1807 at home in bad health. On taking the degree of A.M. at the college commencement of September, 1807, I was prevailed on by President Smith to accept the Junior Tutorship in Nassau Hall. Thus my three most respected teachers successively sought me out in my humble obscurity, and almost compelled me to enter upon the course of labour and study which I have followed to the present day.

“But your good father gave me the start—put me in the right place, at the A B C of the art and mystery which he so admirably adorned and ennobled. Had I begun at a higher post—with big boys and Latin and Greek, I should probably have broken down or given up in despair and disgust. He used to aid me—show me how to get along—and so kindly and wisely! without seeming to interfere, or even to assume any superiority. In the long evenings, after tea, he generally came to my room for an hour or two, or more—when all sorts of things were talked about besides French, which was my chief study. Perrin’s Grammar and Exercises were soon mastered, *Telemaque* read through, and other books looked into. We occasionally took up a Greek or Latin poet, or rather *he* did—and then to hear *him* read! I could have listened all night without dreaming or weariness. He was a thorough prosodist, and a capital *reader* of English, Greek, Latin and French—especially of the finest poetic passages. In all these languages he seemed perfectly at home. His scholarship was minutely accurate—extending to, and embracing every grammatical nicety and idiomatic peculiarity. Among the many good teachers with whom I have been acquainted during the last fifty years, the *two* who constantly loom up in memory, as decidedly *first* and *highest* in my estimation, are James Stevenson and Robert Finley. They were, and are, my model educators. Their superiors I have not known. Their equals I could not name. And yet they were most unlike each other.”

After drawing a graphic picture of the peculiar excellencies of this good man, as the father and companion of his pupils, who could talk,

laugh and play with them “without compromising a particle of true dignity,” he says in conclusion:—

“His eminent worth as a teacher has ever exalted him, in my view, as *facile princeps* among the *nomina clara* of that meritorious class of benefactors to which he professionally belonged. I regret to have written so largely of myself and so little of your father.

“N.B.—This is altogether a private communication, and not for the public. With my best wishes for the happiness and prosperity of all the living representatives of our lamented and revered father, I remain, very truly and respectfully, your Christian brother and most obedient servant.”

II. STUDIES AND ATTAINMENTS AT PRINCETON.

The period of Dr. Lindsley's residence at Princeton, from his acceptance of a Tutorship in 1807 to his final resignation and removal to Nashville in 1824, was one of vigorous intellectual growth. During these seventeen years—fourteen of them being spent in official connection with the College, and the rest, including a few brief absences and excursions, in theological study—his course was steadily and rapidly onward and upward. It was the period which determined and fixed his whole subsequent career as an educator. It placed him at the head—*facile princeps*—of one of the three oldest and most important of our Northern colleges, and gave him an extended and enviable reputation, both as a scholar and an instructor. We have often heard him refer to the enthusiasm and delight with which he pursued the studies and discharged the duties of this period. Especially was he in his element as Librarian of the institution. There everything was systematized and arranged with absolute perfection. It was his home, his sanctuary, his society. He knew every author familiarly, and every author's precise place on the shelves. He knew all the different editions, and was not satisfied with any but the best editions, and in all old standard authors, regarded it as a great point, to procure the “*Editiones Principes*.”

But, not to go into anything like a detailed account of the various studies and attainments of this period, it will be sufficient to give the

general result and impression of the whole, as stated by a few competent judges, who saw him thus in his early prime. In a brief sketch of him in the fourth volume of the *Annals of the American Pulpit*, Dr. Sprague says: "When I became a member of the Theological Seminary at Princeton, in 1816, Dr. Lindsley was a Professor in the College. As soon as I saw him, and before I knew who he was, he impressed me as a man of mark—his fine, intelligent and commanding countenance, and symmetrical person, and dignified air, left me in no doubt that he was one of the intellectual nobility of the place. Though he used regularly to attend the College Chapel, yet, during my connection with the Seminary, he never preached there, and I believe, rarely, if ever, preached at all. But he used to attend very often the evening exercises of the Seminary, which consisted in the discussion of some question previously agreed upon; and on those occasions I think he rarely failed to speak. And he never spoke without evincing keen discrimination and great polemic dexterity. Whatever the subject might be he always took a liberal and enlarged view of it: and showed the most expansive Christian sympathies. My impression then was, and still is, that his views of Christian doctrine, as well as of church polity, were of just about the same type with that of Dr. Smith, under whom he had studied, and for whose talents and character he cherished an almost boundless admiration. My personal acquaintance with him, while I was a member of the Seminary, was very limited; and yet, so strongly marked was his character, that there was perhaps no man in Princeton of whom I carried away a more distinct impression."

Rev. Dr. Maclean, President of the College of New Jersey, in the same work, writing after a lapse of thirty years, describes him at this period in the following terms: "He was strong, fervid and bold; and not altogether free from defects common to men of ardent mind and nervous temperament. In conversation and debate he was ready and fluent; yet he very seldom ventured to preach without writing. I have no recollection of his doing so more than once while he was connected with this institution. His manner in the pulpit was plain and unaffected, yet earnest and impressive. With the students he was

a favourite preacher; and at their request he published several of his sermons. The discourse which perhaps attracted more attention than any other which he published during his residence here, was his 'Plea for the Theological Seminary.' It seems however to have wrought differently upon different minds: for, while it led the Rev. Dr. Codman, of Dorchester, Mass., to make a donation of a thousand dollars to the Seminary, it gave great offence in certain other quarters, on account of its supposed allusions to some prominent individuals; and it was thought that this indirectly influenced him in declining the presidency of the College, which was subsequently tendered him.

"In his attention to his professional duties, Dr. Lindsley was always prompt and unflinching. Nothing short of absolute inability to leave his house would induce him to absent himself from any college exercise which it belonged to him to conduct. As a college officer, he was always popular, although he was sometimes severe in his rebukes. He was easy of access, and ever ready to encourage and aid any one desirous to advance in knowledge. He was fond of conversation, cheerful, and often playful in his remarks; and perhaps occasionally somewhat unguarded. He was a warm and true friend, but manifested his friendship by actions rather than by professions. On this point I can speak with entire confidence; for I testify of that of which I have the best evidence possible. To few of my friends do I owe more than to Dr. Lindsley. For a year after I was admitted to the first degree in the Arts, he most kindly directed my studies; and to his recommendation chiefly I owed my appointment, first as Tutor, and then as Professor in the College. Others of his pupils doubtless can speak of like kindnesses shown to them; but none can have more reason than I had to revere his memory."

There are abundant testimonials to show, that his whole career at Princeton was one of extraordinary success and brilliancy. His promptness and energy of character, his tact as a disciplinarian, his accurate and extensive learning, his classic polish as a preacher, his dignified and scholarly bearing, his enthusiastic zeal for letters,—all these and other characteristics contributed to increase his popularity among the students, and thus to spread his reputation over the

country. Had he remained at Princeton, he would, no doubt, have carried out, at an early day, many schemes of authorship which he had already projected, and which seem to have been defeated by his removal to a part of the country where the popular speech was then more in demand than the learned treatise. He had, in fact, at this time, some works ready, or nearly ready, for the press, which were never published. This was probably the case with his "Course of Lectures on Greek Literature," delivered during this period, and, as he tells us, intended for publication. It was at all events so with another work. We find a Prospectus among his papers, bearing date of September, 1821, with the names of some sixty subscribers, in which D. & E. Fenton, of Trenton, New Jersey, propose to publish, in two volumes octavo, a "Course of Lectures on the Arts, Science and Literature of the Ancients. By Prof. Lindsley, of the College of New Jersey." At the time these large and learned treatises were written and ready for the press he had not passed his thirty-fifth year; and it is curious, but needless now, to conjecture, what a career of authorship might have awaited him, had his life been spent at the East, instead of the West. His case, however, is a striking illustration of the manner in which men of the very first talents and attainments, once fully engaged in the more active and diversified duties of a pioneer life in the South and West, are compelled to relinquish projects of literary and scientific labour which might have filled the world with their fame, and to live comparatively unknown and unappreciated. It is the necessary lot of all labourers on new fields. They have the consolation, however, of preparing the way for others who shall come after them, to reap the fruit, while they honour the memory of such faithful toil. Still, these early habits of study, and these rich stores of learning, in Dr. Lindsley's case, were by no means lost. They only prepared him the better for that great work to which his life was to be devoted on a different and perhaps more important field.

It will not be out of place to introduce, in this connection, the two following communications from his early companions in study, recently received in reply to our inquiries touching his standing at Princeton and his preceding history—the one from Dr. Isaac V. Brown, of

Trenton, and the other from Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen, of New Brunswick :—

TRENTON, N. J., September 2, 1860.

DEAR SIR:—In regard to Dr. Lindsley's youth and early education, I may say, that he and I were members of Dr. Finley's Academy in Baskingridge, New Jersey, at its origin—both boarders in his family for some time and room mates. He was always quite sensitive, but we harmonized very well. I was fond of him. He was studious, orderly and peaceful. Being rather slender, young and feeble, he did not enter very warmly into the athletic exercises and competitions of the boys in general, but passed the interim of school hours in reading some amusing book or in study. This will account, in some measure, for his being pre-eminent as a scholar, in all classes and in all studies. In college he shone quite conspicuously, particularly in the Ancient Classics and in Belles-Lettres studies. Hence he was a classical writer of the highest order in our own native tongue. I had ample opportunities to know that he could write Latin with great facility. In the Greek also he was very accomplished at that early period. When *Xenophon's Anabasis* was first introduced pretty generally among the students at Princeton, as a novel, more than a class-book, he observed to me, that "he had read it through for amusement in one day."

Dr. Lindsley had the respect and confidence of the Trustees and literary gentlemen sympathizing with Princeton College very generally; and in this spirit, I think with unanimity, we offered to him the presidency of that institution. But some peculiar views and difficulties in his own mind on this subject, inclined him to prefer his most important and valuable adventure to the West—a decision which resulted in conferring upon the growing population of the great Western Valley inestimable and countless literary, moral and religious benefits. During the last year of his life he and I had extensive correspondence, reviewing the scenes and events of our early days. These letters contain nothing that would be valuable to you. The correspondence closed with a promise on my part to spend a week with him at New Albany, just preceding the Assembly's meeting at

Nashville. Indisposition prevented my undertaking so long a journey, and his death soon after, interrupted forever our subsequent intercourse in this world.

With great respect, dear sir, yours, etc.

ISAAC V. BROWN.

NEW BRUNSWICK, August 27, 1860.

DEAR SIR:—I am glad to learn, from your favour received to-day, that you are preparing a memorial of the life of my early friend and classmate, Dr. Philip Lindsley, formerly of this State, and I cheerfully comply with your request, and send a few lines in respect to my recollections of him at Princeton College.

My acquaintance with Dr. L. commenced at Baskingridge, New Jersey, as a classmate with him at Mr. Finley's Academy, in 1800. From that institution we entered Princeton College in 1802, and graduated in 1804. Our class with Mr. Finley was composed of Dr. Lindsley, Dr. Kirkpatrick, Samuel L. Southard, Mr. Albanus Logan, of Germantown, Pennsylvania, and myself. Dr. Kirkpatrick and myself survive.

Of my friend Dr. Lindsley it is pleasant to remember his uniform diligence, propriety and excellent scholarship. He loved his books—often when we, his fellows, were pursuing the sports of the bat and ball, he would be exploring the roots of the classics. And yet he was genial, and had a ready sympathy with our youthful pleasures.

After our graduation, I renewed a happy companionship with him at Princeton—he as Tutor in the College and I as a student at law.

In all the relations of life he was an exemplary Christian gentleman—an honour to his native State of New Jersey and to the cause of sound science and religion. He left to his children the richest of all legacies—a good name.

Very respectfully and truly yours,

THEO. FRELINGHUYSEN.

In addition to these, we subjoin the following letter from Dr. Robert Baird, author of "Religion in America," and other works, addressed to the Editor, under date of Yonkers, New York, October 8, 1860, giving his personal recollections of the same, as well as of a later period:—

MY DEAR SIR:—I entered the Theological Seminary at Princeton

in the autumn of 1819, and went through the course of three years' studies in that highly-favoured institution. As I had not pursued my academical studies at the College of New Jersey, I did not become acquainted with the Rev. Dr. Lindsley (or Professor Lindsley, as he was then called) until I had been there a year, if not longer. From the autumn of 1821 to that of 1822—my third and last year in the Theological Seminary—I was a Tutor in the College, having succeeded the late Rev. Dr. John Breckinridge in that office, and of course was thrown much into the company of Dr. Lindsley—who was Professor of Languages in the institution as well as Vice-President of it—by reason of the official intercourse which the duties of the several members of the Faculty required. During that year, my acquaintance with that distinguished scholar, teacher, writer and preacher, which had commenced the year before, became quite intimate; and during the following year I saw much of him, for I took charge of an Academy or Grammar School in Princeton, upon leaving the Theological Seminary, and held it during five years and a half. Dr. Lindsley only remained one year after I left the College. During that year, however, my intercourse with him was even more frequent and intimate than during my tutorship. Nine or ten years afterwards I spent a fortnight with him at Nashville, Tennessee. A year or two later still, I had the pleasure of seeing him at the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, where I then resided. After that I never met him again until I spent a night with him at New Albany, in the early spring of 1855, only a few months before he died.

Of Dr. Lindsley's appearance, manner, tones of voice and mode of speaking, I have a most vivid recollection. He was one of the ripest scholars in all that constitutes classic and general literature, including history, I have ever known. His style of writing possessed the two great qualities of clearness and strength, rather than smoothness and refinement. It was a fair type of his style of speaking, which was dignified, emphatic and forcible. He preached very seldom whilst he was a Professor in the College of New Jersey. I think I heard only three or four of these sermons, nearly all of which, I believe, were published. A few of the sermons which he preached during his stay at

Princeton, after I came to the place, I did not have the privilege to hear. So great was his reputation for scholarship, for the originality of his conceptions, boldness in the expression of them, and a certain indescribable intonation, look and manner, that the College Chapel was sure to be crowded when he preached, by the students of the two institutions (College and Theological Seminary) and such of the citizens as may have been so fortunate as to hear that he was going to occupy the pulpit. He usually read his sermons, but not very closely, if I remember rightly. But whether closely or not, his manner and tones of voice were so striking that it was impossible for an audience not to hear him with intensest interest.

Dr. Lindsley's influence over the minds of the students was extraordinary. He was an excellent teacher; but his manner was so decided and dignified, that it diffused over every class that came before him a certain awe that rendered all trifling to be impossible. A good deal of this same feeling pervaded the congregation when he preached. I can hardly conceive of a man who could have more influence over young men in the lecture-room, or over a congregation composed of intelligent hearers. He was, in every sense, no ordinary man, whether natural endowments, mental culture and acquisitions, manner or voice be considered. I can never think of him without the deepest pensiveness; for he was a friend to whom I feel that I owe much, and whose influence I enjoyed at the period of life when I most needed it.

With great respect, I am yours, most truly,

R. BAIRD.

III. HIS REMOVAL TO THE WEST.

Situated as Dr Lindsley was at Princeton, with everything around him congenial to his tastes and studies, having already an ample salary and the professorship of his choice, and with the presidency of his Alma Mater urgently pressed upon him, it seemed surprising, and to some unaccountable, that he should have resigned all the bright prospects of usefulness and honour which awaited him there, to go to what was then a comparatively new country, and take charge of an institution, at the time almost unknown, and even struggling for existence. At the

first, and indeed for several years, he utterly declined all overtures for a removal. As early as 1817, he had twice declined the presidency of Transylvania University in Kentucky: subsequently he declined that of the Ohio University at Athens. It was not until Cumberland College had waited on him a year, refusing to take any denial, that he consented to accept that position: and, as he states, not without a very great struggle at last. We are not left, however, to conjecture, as to the motives which governed him in this important step. He has placed on record the reasons for his choice. And they are alike satisfactory and creditable to him as a Christian minister and a lover of his country. The prevailing motive seems to have been that he might accomplish a greater and more needful work than he could have done where he was. The following extracts from his journal and letters will show at once, why he refused the presidency at Princeton, and why at last he was constrained to take a presidency in the Southwest.

Speaking of the offer from the Ohio University, in 1823, he says: "It was then my fixed purpose never to accept of a college presidency anywhere. I infinitely preferred my peaceful classical chair at Princeton." He had then already declined the first invitation to Nashville, and the year before, 1822, on the resignation of Dr. Ashbel Green, had absolutely refused to be elected his successor in the presidency of Nassau Hall. But still, in April, 1823, after serving one year as the actual president of the institution, and after Dr. John H. Rice, of Virginia, whom he had nominated, had also declined, he was again proposed, and, without his knowledge, unanimously elected, "notwithstanding," says he, "my well-known disinclination to the office." He again declined; whereupon Dr. James Carnahan was chosen. All the proceedings in the case (of which he has preserved a careful record) show that his highest wish at this time, was to remain at Princeton and retain his loved Greek professorship. As to the presidency, he says, "I did not think myself qualified for so arduous and responsible a trust." Long afterwards, when the invitations and overtures mentioned in a former notice were crowding upon him from all quarters, he makes the following entry: "I here state, once for all, that I never, directly or indirectly, sought a college office or appointment. I was

in no instance, when *elected*, consulted beforehand. In all cases, when solicited to be a *candidate*, I refused, and was not chosen. So that every actual appointment took me completely by surprise—as much so as if it had come from the moon.”

In 1824, after having at last visited Nashville and decided to accept the presidency of Cumberland College, he was authorized by its Board of Trustees, on returning to the East, to receive donations there in money, books and apparatus for the institution. He issued a circular to that effect, to his friends, which was also published in the Eastern papers. From that document, and from his correspondence with the Board of Trustees—all preserved among his papers—we learn what were the motives which prevailed on him to give up the “peaceful classical chair at Princeton” and cast in his lot with the people of the West. In the former he says: “Throughout the immense valley of the Lower Mississippi, containing at least a million of inhabitants, there exists not a single college. Hitherto a few wealthy individuals have sent their sons to Northern and Eastern institutions, while the great body of the people have been unable to afford the expense, or indisposed to subject their children to the danger and inconvenience of so long a journey and of so distant a residence from the parental roof. The time has arrived when they must have the means of education at their own doors, or be deprived of its benefits altogether. It is the purpose of the friends of Cumberland College, in attempting to give it a respectable and efficient organization, to remedy the existing evils to the greatest extent within their power.”

But he expresses his mind more fully in a letter, dated Princeton, January 2, 1824, (while the matter of his acceptance was still pending) and addressed “To J. Trimble, H. Crabb, R. C. Foster, E. H. Foster, and A. Balch, Esquires, Committee, Nashville, Tennessee.” The letter is long, and we have room for only a few extracts, bearing on the present point.

“Having been repeatedly invited to the most respectable institutions in Ohio, Kentucky and Tennessee, I begin to think, contrary to all my former views and predilections, that Providence has destined me for the West. I will deal frankly with you. I had given the preference, in

my own mind to Nashville over every other place beyond the mountains which has been proposed to me. There were several things, however, which I was desirous to ascertain, with as much certainty as possible, before I could feel myself justifiable in acceding to your proposals."

After mentioning several of these, such as the healthfulness of the climate, the prospect of salary, the expenses of the journey, etc., he says: "I wished to be assured of a reasonable prospect of building up an institution worthy of the name of a college, and worthy of the country in which it is located, and of the age in which we live. This would be my chief and prevailing motive and object in undertaking so difficult and arduous an enterprise. As a means of pecuniary emolument I would not think of it a single moment. I have no idea that my situation, in this particular, would be improved by this, or by any change. Could I, however, upon good grounds, indulge the hope of becoming the happy instrument of reviving and establishing your college, upon a broad and permanent basis, without any serious injury to my family, I should be ready to embark heart and hand in the undertaking."

He then gives his views at length upon the whole subject of professorships, course of studies, etc., and concludes as follows: "Should I be induced by your repeated and earnest solicitations to leave the land of my fathers, and of all those early and long-cherished associations, which mainly contribute to happiness in this life, I shall need much of your generous sympathy and indulgence. I shall calculate on meeting you as friends and brothers; on receiving from you every kindly aid and support, which my peculiar situation may require; and on your cordially co-operating, with one mind and with steady purpose, to promote the best interests of a great public institution—destined, we will hope, to become, under the smiles of a gracious Providence, the richest blessing of which a free and Christian country can boast. I pray God to direct you and me in the right way, and to bring this matter to such a result as will insure his lasting favour and benediction."

It has already been stated, that, in addition to his other duties, he had acted as President at Princeton for one year after Dr. Green's

resignation, that is, from September, 1822, to August, 1823. The Board of Trustees, at their meeting August fifth, passed the following resolution, namely:—

“That the thanks of this Board be given to the Rev. Dr. Lindsley for the faithful and able manner in which he has discharged the duties of President of the College, since the resignation of the Rev. Dr. Green, in September last; and that Dr. Miller and Mr. Woodhull be a committee to communicate to Dr. Lindsley the high sense which the Board entertain of the value of those services so honourable to himself and so useful to the College.

(Signed)

“GEORGE S. WOODHULL, *Clerk.*”

And the following is a copy of his final letter of resignation of the offices of Professor, Vice-President, etc.

To the Honourable the Board of Trustees of the College of New Jersey.

GENTLEMEN:—Constrained by circumstances which could neither be foreseen nor controlled, to accept the Presidency of Cumberland College in Tennessee, I beg leave to resign the office of Professor, etc., in the College of New Jersey. Having been connected with this institution since the period of early youth, it cannot be supposed that I leave it with indifference. I regret that it has not been in my power to render it any service at all adequate to the benefits received and the privileges enjoyed. With my best wishes for its continued prosperity, and for the happiness of all concerned in its government and instruction, and with sentiments of gratitude which time and distance can only increase, I bid the honoured guardians of Nassau Hall an affectionate, a respectful, and a final farewell.

I am, gentlemen, very respectfully, your most obedient servant,

PHILIP LINDSLEY.

PRINCETON, September 28, 1824.

Accordingly on the fifteenth of October following he set out for Nashville, with his family—Mrs. Lindsley and four children—and arrived there on the twenty-fourth of December. The College had been opened with thirty students about the middle of November, under Prof. George

W. McGehee and Tutor (afterwards Professor) Nathaniel Cross, whom he had engaged, and who had preceded him to the place.

On the 12th of January, 1825, the ceremonies of his Inauguration took place with considerable pomp and parade. Before leaving Princeton, he had, in order to be prepared for any emergency, written two Inaugural addresses—one in English, and one in Latin according to the usage of the old colleges. The Trustees preferred English to Latin. So he delivered the English address to a crowded audience at the Presbyterian Church. It was immediately printed in the newspapers, and two thousand copies in pamphlet form. “This,” says he, “was probably the first *English* Inaugural on similar occasions. There have been none in *Latin* since. The views expressed, though trite and commonplace *now*, were sufficiently novel *then*, to command a good deal of attention.”*

IV. HISTORICAL AND ARCHÆOLOGICAL STUDIES.

Dr. Lindsley seems to have had his attention specially turned at a very early period to the investigation of the science, literature and civilization of the ancients. There was probably no department of learning in which he was more fully read, and to which he had devoted more close and careful study. It may be questioned whether any scholar in our country has ever had a more extensive and minute acquaintance with the whole literature of the subject, or gone into it with a more hearty and enthusiastic devotion. It continued to be, through the

* It was always his custom, while President at Nashville, to confer degrees in Latin, addressing briefly the Board of Trustees, the Faculty, and the graduates in that language, and wearing the robes of office. We find among his papers a Latin Baccalaureate, entitled, “*Oratio de Eloquentia*,” which was pronounced at the beginning of the exercises of the seventh annual commencement of the University, October 3, 1832. Though few of the audience could follow him on these occasions, still they listened with great interest, attracted by his graceful manner and the exceeding distinctness and precision with which he spoke the language. The people felt that they could *almost* understand it: or at any rate, that it was not lost on their *boys*. While at Princeton, he still adhered to the old custom of teaching the Greek (at least to the lower classes) in the use of the Latin-Greek Grammar.

whole period of his professional life, one of his richest themes of instruction in the lecture-room, as well as one of his most interesting topics of conversation in literary and cultivated circles. And not unfrequently, both in the pulpit and through the press, he took occasion to bring out, in popular form, the rich treasures of learning which he had gathered in this wide domain. He states in a note to one of his early manuscript volumes on this subject, that the material thus collected had served as the text for much extemporaneous commentary and illustration. We find among his papers a course of lectures carefully written out, in six manuscript volumes, and bearing the following title—"Archæology—Hints and Materials for a Course of Lectures on the Arts, Science and Literature of Antiquity. Delivered to a Volunteer Class in the College of New Jersey, during the Winter Session of 1820 and 1821."

In these volumes he discusses, among other kindred topics, the origin and affinities of language, the population of the ancient world, the peopling of America, the creation of the earth, the deluge, the primitive state of mankind, origin of the arts, unity and diversity of human species, early history of mankind, progress of civilization, science of the Egyptians and Chaldeans, geography of the ancients, navigation and commerce of the ancient world, painting, sculpture, and architecture of the Egyptians, medical art in Egypt, chemistry, metallurgy, characteristic differences of Greek and Latin poetry, originality of the classic writers, originality of Homer. But no one could derive from this mere outline of topics anything like an adequate conception of the amount of reading and research everywhere indicated in the volumes themselves. On a blank page at the beginning stand the following words: "N.B.—These volumes do not contain my lectures on Greek Literature, which were once designed for publication. Here will be found only miscellaneous hints and quotations for occasional extemporaneous remarks, illustrations, etc. They may be of some use to my children in their private studies. Not a sentence, however, is ever to be published."

We have not felt at liberty to violate this last decided prohibition, though we know that at one time he designed the work for publication.

Accordingly, nothing from these volumes, which still remain, rich as they are in learning and full of interest, has found a place in the works now collected and published. The Lectures on Greek Literature, which he refers to as being also designed for the press, were never published. As he found it difficult to satisfy his own mind, they fell victims to one of those manuscript burnings, of which mention is made from time to time in his journal. He had studied the Greek language with that minute criticism which an artist carries into the study of the finest models in nature, and he had been accustomed to teach it with all the enthusiasm of an amateur. It is deeply to be regretted that he did not carry out his intention of publishing those Lectures on Greek Literature. The injunction against publishing the Lectures on Archæology, was probably owing, partly to their being prepared in a somewhat fragmentary form, and partly to the fact, that at the earnest solicitation of the editor of the *American Biblical Repository* he was induced to publish the substance of one or two of them in that journal in 1840 and 1841. On the fly-leaf of one of the manuscript volumes, he says: "The substance of the following lecture, corrected and improved, was published in the *American Biblical Repository* for July, 1841." The reader will find that article, and also two others from the same journal, republished in this third volume of his works: and from them may form an idea of the ability and learning of the whole series. The articles excited no little attention at the time, both in our own country and in England, and were regarded as establishing clearly his main positions, that the original and most ancient condition of the human family was civilized and not savage; and that in every age of the world civilized man has somewhere been found.

Since the time of Dr. Lindsley's preparation of these lectures in the winter of 1820, and even since the publication of a few of them in the *Biblical Repository* for 1841, there has been vast progress made in this whole field of investigation. The position so boldly taken by him from the beginning, and ever afterwards defended with so much ability and eloquence, namely, that the great Oriental nations, which figure in the early Bible history, had reached a degree of civilization and of advancement in art, science and literature, which the modern

world has never given them credit for—has been but the more and more confirmed by all the recent researches in Egypt, the explorations in Arabia and Palestine, and the wonderful discoveries at Nineveh and Babylon. He seems to have been led, as a necessary deduction from his classical and archæological studies, to precisely those conclusions which have since been put beyond all controversy, by the actual observations and discoveries of travellers on the ground. But Layard and Rawlinson in Babylonia, Champollion, Rosellini, Wilkinson and Lepsius in Egypt, after inspecting for themselves all these wonderful monuments of ancient greatness, could not have had a deeper conviction of the truth thus established, nor have more zealously defended it against all cavillers, than Dr. Lindsley did as far back as 1820, before any of their explorations began. There was no one thing which ever made a deeper impression on the writer's mind, while under Dr. Lindsley's instruction as a pupil from 1831 to 1834, than the glowing eloquence with which he entered into this theme in the lecture-room, and with which he seemed to open for us a new world of power and beauty amid the ruins of the old.

As to his general reading, it was, both in extent and variety, far beyond the ordinary range of men engaged in the duties of the practical educator or the minister of the gospel. In fact it is a matter of wonder how he found the time to read as much as he did. "What are you reading now, Doctor?" said the writer on one occasion, entering his study and seeing a book open on the table. "Oh, nothing but Gibbon, for the fortieth time perhaps," was the reply. This playful exaggeration was simply to indicate what was with him a common habit—that of a *repeated* reading of the same author. The following paper, copied here as it stands in his journal, and evidently written with no expectation of its ever seeing the light, is perhaps the best illustration we can give of the way his time was spent in the study, when he had reached his sixty-first year. It is curious and instructive, not only as showing an ardent thirst for knowledge unabated by the lapse of years, but an amount and range of reading which few men are able to compass at any age:—

"December 28, 1847.—I have, this evening, completed the reading

of The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England, by Edward (Hyde) Earl of Clarendon. Oxford, 1839. Best edition. (I had previously read Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches, with Elucidations by Thomas Carlyle; also, The Protector: A Vindication, by J. H. Merle D'Aubigne, D.D., as well as all the great histories—Hume, Henry, Lingard, Pictorial England, Universal History, Russell, Alison, etc. at different periods.) I had often 'looked' into Clarendon, but had never thoroughly *studied* him before. Rather hard reading, with his endless periods, each including a score or two of facts, incidents and sage reflections, put together with much labour, art and skill, but with little or nothing of the natural, transparent, graceful simplicity of diction and style, which everybody sees through at a glance, and always reads with ease and pleasure. The details, minute and prolix as they are, especially his biographical sketches, are often amusing and singularly interesting. His prejudices and fixed opinions are too obvious to mislead. The statesman, the demagogue, the enthusiast, the reformer, the radical, the whig, the tory, the Presbyterian, the Churchman, the Independent, the revolutionist, the warrior, the noble, the *plebs*, may all be instructed; perhaps enlightened, by the perusal of the book. It is a good—probably the best—picture or description of the wickedness of the age. The venality, cowardice, treachery, avarice, selfishness, hypocrisy, ambition, bigotry, cunning, knavery, of all classes, orders, sects and parties, throughout England, Scotland and Ireland, could hardly be surpassed, and are boldly exhibited. Cromwell and Monk became the most conspicuous and were the most fortunate amid the host of adventurers. The Restoration of the Second Charles was more remarkable even, and, at the time, more unlooked-for, than the deposition and judicial execution of the First.

“I have also lately read again Bishop Burnett's History of his own Times, from the Restoration of King Charles II. to the Conclusion of the Treaty of Peace at Utrecht in the Reign of Queen Anne. The more I read him, the better I like him, notwithstanding his faults and foibles. The Table Talk of John Selden, Esq., with a Biographical Preface and Notes by S. W. Singer, Esq., London, 1847, contains

some curious facts, and several opinions and speculations rather novel for the age in which he lived.

“*December 31.*—Among the books which I have read within the last few months, are the entire works of Edmund Burke, in nine volumes, Boston, 1839. I had read much of Burke before, and often. He is worth a very careful and discriminating study by *conservative* politicians and by the amateurs of classic English. In elaborate elegance of style—in learning, wit, (or humour,) sagacity, candour, patriotism, wisdom, integrity, devotion to Church and State as by law established, hatred to all Gallican revolutionary acts and projects, love of justice at home and abroad, opposition to tyranny in India and America, etc., he was *primus inter pares*—a great man in a brilliant age—good, wise, eloquent, brave.

“By-the-way, I wish I had kept some note or account of the books read, since I became a reader, which is nearly ever since I can remember anything. I have read far too many. I have been always reading. I read rapidly, and read all sorts of books. I will try to set down such as I have read during the year (1847) ending this day. Besides those already specified are the following: Elements of International Law, by Henry Wheaton, LL.D., third edition, 1846—(I had read the first edition before, as well as Kent, and all the standard authors;) System of Logic, by John Stuart Mill; Elements of Logic, by Henry P. Tappan; Exposition of the Constitution of the United States, by Joseph Story, LL.D.; the Elements of Morality, by William Whewell, D.D.; German University Education, by Walter C. Perry, Phil. Dr.; The Literary Remains of the Rev. Jonathan Maxy, D.D., by Romeo Elton, D.D.; Essays on Christian Union, by Thomas Chalmers, D.D., and seven other eminent ministers; The Sufferings of Christ, by a Layman; The Statesman’s Manual, containing the Addresses and Messages of the Presidents, etc., in two thick volumes, 8vo., by Edwin Williams; Supplementary Volume to the Encyclopædia Americana, (vol. 14,) by Henry Vethake, LL.D.; Historical Sketch of Trinity Church, N.Y., by the Rev. William Berrian, D.D.; Memoirs of Eminent Christian Females, by the Rev. James Gardner, A.M., M.D.; Life of Reginald Heber, D.D., Bishop of Calcutta, by his

Widow, two large volumes, (second reading;) The Works of Charles Lamb, two vols., by Thomas Noon Talfourd, (second reading;) Washington and his Generals, by J. T. Headley, (with several other works of the same author;) Pictorial Life of Taylor, and others; Life of Jeremy Belknap, D.D., by his Granddaughter, 1847; Life and Correspondence of Joseph Reed, by his grandson, William B. Reed, two vols., 1847; History of the Presbyterian Church in the State of Kentucky, by the Rev. Robert Davidson, D.D., 1847; Sketches of North Carolina, Historical and Biographical, by the Rev. William Henry Foote; History of Rome, by Dr. Leonhard Schmitz, F.R.S.E., Rector of the High School of Edinburgh, 1847; Documents and Letters intended to illustrate the Revolutionary Incidents of Queen's County, L. I., by Henry Onderdonk, Jr., New York, 1846; The Correspondence and Miscellanies of the Hon. John Cotton Smith, LL.D., formerly Governor of Connecticut, by Rev. Wm. W. Andrews, 1847; Amenities of Literature, by I. D'Israeli, two volumes, (second reading;) also, Curiosities of Literature, by the same, in five volumes, (second or third reading;) Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church, by Nicholas Wiseman, D.D., etc.; Memoirs of the most eminent American Mechanics, by Henry Howe, New York, 1847; Memoranda of a Residence at the Court of London, by Richard Rush; History of the Rise and Progress of the Arts of Design in the United States, by William Dunlap, two volumes; Annals and Occurrences of New York City and State in the Olden Time, by John F. Watson; The History of Long Island, from its Discovery and Settlement to the Present Time, by Benjamin F. Thompson, two volumes; History of the New Netherlands, Province of New York and State, etc., by William Dunlap, two volumes; The History of New Jersey, from its Discovery by Europeans, etc., by Thomas F. Gordon; A Memoir of the Life of William Livingston, by Theodore Sedgwick, Jr.; Collections of the New York Historical Society for the year 1809, (vol. 1;) Reminiscences of Old Gloucester, etc., by Isaac Mickle; Historical Notes of the American Colonies and Revolution, from 1754 to 1775, by William Griffith, Burlington, N. J.,

1843; *An Authentic Historical Memoir of the Schuylkill Fishing Company, etc.*; *A History of Long Island, etc.*, by Nathaniel S. Prime, 1845; *Notes on the Early Settlement of the Northwestern Territory*, by Jacob Burnet, 1847; *The Life of William Alexander, Earl of Sterling, etc.*, by William A. Duer, LL.D., 1847; *Memoirs of his Own Time, with Reminiscences of the Men and Events of the Revolution*, by Alexander Graydon, 1846; *Lyell's Travels in North America*; *Collections of the New Jersey Historical Society*, vol. 1, 1846; *History of New Netherlands, or New York under the Dutch*, by E. B. O'Callaghan, 1846; *Travels Over the Table Lands and Cordilleras of Mexico, during the years 1843 and 1844*, by Albert M. Gilliam; *The Student Life of Germany*, by William Howitt; *Lectures on the Acts of the Apostles*, by John Dick, D.D.; *Lectures on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans*, by Thomas Chalmers, D.D., LL.D.; *Writings of Hugh Swinton Legaré*, edited by his Son, in 2 vols., 1846; *Transactions of the American Ethnological Society*, (vol. 1;) *Clinton's Fasti Hellenici*, 3 vols. 4to.; *Harleian Miscellany*, 12 vols. 8vo.; *Menzel's German Literature*, 4 vols. 8vo.; *Fosbroke's Encyclopædia of Antiquities*, 2 vols. 8vo.; *Nichol's Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century*, 6 vols. 8vo.; *Belknap's American Biography*, 2 vols. 8vo.; *Burnett's History of the Reformation*, 7 vols. 8vo.; *Prize Essays on a Congress of Nations; Book of Peace; Hancock on Peace; Upham on Peace; Dymond on War, etc.*; *Public Documents, Executive and Congressional; Senate Documents; House Journal; etc. etc.*

“(By-the-way, I have read, from time to time, the numerous volumes of *Public Documents, Journals, Diplomatic Correspondence, etc.*, published by order of Congress, edited by Sparks, Force, etc.; the *Madison Papers; Washington's Life and Letters*, by Sparks, with all of Sparks's publications. How many volumes belong to this category, and how many to the present year, I cannot tell.)

“*History of the Church of Scotland*, by Rev. W. M. Hetherington, A.M.; *A Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, edited by John Kitto, D.D., F.S.A., 2 vols.—(in this work, article *Antediluvians*, vol. i. pp. 156–158, my *Essays in the American Biblical Repository* are respect-

fully referred to, and my theory is sustained;) reviews, pamphlets, tracts, newspapers, periodicals of all kinds; articles in various encyclopædias, commentaries, dictionaries; passages in the Greek, Latin and French classics; authors consulted for special purposes, etc., far more than could be named; sundry works of Carlyle, Brougham, Merle D'Aubigne, Guizot, Lyell, Tupper, Stephens, Prescott; a tract entitled True and Faithful Relation of a Worthy Discourse between Colonel John Hampden and Colonel Oliver Cromwell, preceded by an Explanatory Preface, London, 1847, being an exact reprint or *fac-simile* of the original or first edition—(this tract purports to be written by William Spurstowe, Minister of the Word and Rector of the parish of Great Hampden in 1636)—the motto of Hampden was, 'Vestigia nulla retrorsum;' 'The Lord is our strength,' was that of Cromwell. Vision; or, Hell, Purgatory and Paradise of Dante Alighieri, translated by Rev. Henry F. Cary, A.M., London, 1844; Sketches of Modern Literature and Eminent Literary Men, (being a Gallery of Literary Portraits,) by George Gilfillan; Ireland's Welcome to the Stranger, by A. Nicholson, New York, 1847; The Complete Poetical Works of Robert Burns, with Life, by James Currie, M.D., New York, 1846; The Jerusalem Delivered of Torquato Tasso, translated by J. H. Wiffin, New York, 1846; Memoirs of the Queens of France, by Mrs. Forbes Bush, 2 vols., Philadelphia, 1847; Religio Medici, by Sir Thomas Browne; Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation; Two Volumes of Scottish Biography, by Thomas Murray, LL.D., (sent me by John Coltart, Esq. ;) Brougham's Statesmen; Memoir of De Witt Clinton, by David Hosack, M.D., F.R.S., 4to., New York, 1829; Diary Illustrative of the Times of George the Fourth, Paris, 1838, 2 vols. 12mo.; The Life of Edmund Kean; The Early Jesuit Missions in North America, by Rev. Wm. Ingraham Kip; Supernaturalism in New England, by J. G. Whittier; Sketches of the History of Roman Literature, by Wilkins Tannehill, Nashville, 1846; Memoir of Baron Cuvier, by Mrs. R. Lee, New York, 1847; An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Geography, by P. E. Laurent, Oxford, (England,) 1830; Metaphysical Works of Immanuel Kant, translated from the German by John Richardson, London,

1836; Arnold's Life and Correspondence, by Stanley; History of the Conquest of Peru, by W. H. Prescott, 1847.

"May 30, 1848.—Received (as previously ordered) a copy of Manilius, in 2 vols. 8vo., viz.: 'M. Manilii Astronomicon ex editione Bentleiana cum notis et interpretatione in usum Delphini variis lectionibus notis variorum recensu editionum, et codicum et indice locupletissimo accurate recensitum. In duobus voluminibus. Londini: curante et imprimente, A. J. Valpy, A.M., 1828.' Also, Jouffroy's Introduction to Ethics, including a Critical Survey of Moral Systems, translated from the French (of Jouffroy) by Wm. H. Channing, 2 vols. 12mo., Boston, 1845. The famous *motto*, or *inscription*, prepared for Franklin, 'Eripuit cœlo fulmen sceptrumque tyrannis,' was doubtless borrowed from Manilius. See lib. i. line 104, namely, 'Eripuitque Jovi fulmen viresque tonandi.'"

The foregoing extracts, though long, and intended by the author only for the eye of his children, we trust will not be deemed out of place here, as showing something of the inner life of a student, with the diversified character of his books, and the familiar acquaintance which he must have cultivated with them.

V. LECTURES ON POLITICAL ECONOMY, LAW AND GOVERNMENT.

It will be observed that a very large proportion of the works mentioned by Dr. Lindsley in the foregoing record of his reading for a year, belong to the wide domain of Political Science. Holding that all knowledge was useful and important, he did not restrict himself to any particular branch of it, but sought to cultivate an acquaintance with the whole circle of the sciences. Hence, as the list of works just referred to might indicate, we find him as familiar with all the standard writers on civil government, constitutional and international law, ethics and political economy, as he was with theology, classical literature, archæology or general history. In fact, the strong, practical cast of his mind, while it kept him from going very far into the region of abstract speculation and metaphysical philosophy, seems to have given him a peculiar fondness for the great matter-of-fact questions of morals, jurisprudence, government and political economy. On all these points

he not only read much, but thought much. He was, in fact, a statesman, so far forth as any man can be a statesman without taking part in the actual administration of public affairs. And he was, no doubt, a hundredfold better qualified for such administration than hundreds in our country, who, without either experience or knowledge, are intrusted with it. But, deeply read in the whole science of government, and ever watching the progress of political affairs, with the double interest of a Christian philosopher and a true patriot, he was, on all questions involving civil and religious liberty, public morals, the administration of justice, the relation of capital and labour, the wealth of nations, banking and finance, a profound, practical thinker. In respect for his high calling as a minister of the gospel, he always kept aloof from the petty partisan politics of the day, quietly pointing out the errors and the virtues of both sides, as occasion offered. But in his own proper sphere, the lecture-room, and occasionally in more formal discourses before public associations, he presented, clearly and fully, the well-matured results of his reading and reflections on all these subjects. One of the most interesting and highly-prized studies of the University was that of the senior year, when the class came under his instruction in the departments of Political Economy, Moral Philosophy and Constitutional Law. He taught both by lecture and by text-books. That is, he required the class, in these several studies, as they took them up, to read carefully Paley's Moral Philosophy, Say's Political Economy and Kent's Commentaries, so as to answer any questions he might ask touching the author's facts, arguments and opinions. With this preparation on the part of the class, as a basis, his method, on meeting them in the lecture-room, was to ask a few questions as to the views of their author, without, however, ever opening the book himself; and then, as the answers were given, to expound, illustrate, confirm or refute the doctrine, as the case might be, citing all the different conflicting authorities, and urging, in conclusion, his own views with great earnestness and animation. These lectures were always delivered from the chair. They were, in style and manner, conversations. We never knew him to read a formal, manuscript lecture in the class-room. He was accustomed to read long and learned lectures on all these subjects

before Literary Societies, Lyceums, Mechanics' Associations, etc., at Nashville; but he never *taught* in that fashion. Fully furnished himself at all points, and his ever-active mind teeming with the subject, he judged that the best method to impart instruction in these studies, and to create a fondness for them, was to meet his pupils on the familiar ground of question and answer, where he might at once pour out his own rich stores, and set their minds to work. Nor did he mistake in this. Whatever else the graduates of the University might or might not carry away from its classic halls, they were certain to carry with them for life the most enlarged, liberal and conservative views on all these great questions of moral, social and national polity; and, as a general thing, the most enthusiastic admiration for the wisdom, learning and statesmanship of their preceptor. Many of them have risen to distinction at the bar and on the bench. Some of them have taken part in the administration, both of State and National affairs, and in the halls of legislation have won a place among the leading statesmen of their country. Without any special opportunity of knowing to what they attribute their success, we doubt not that their cheerful testimony would be, that many of the most valuable thoughts and suggestions, and many of the best influences which have contributed to form their intellectual character and to shape their public career, are to be traced back to these masterly lectures on Moral and Political Science.

In this third volume of his works will be found a few of his lectures on political questions, or rather miscellaneous hints and materials for many lectures. The long Discourse on American Democracy, here published, was arranged by him into separate parts, for the convenience of the reader. The larger portion of it, however, was delivered as one continuous discourse, in the morning and afternoon of October 5, 1842, as a Baccalaureate Address before the University, and the remainder during the winter following. The substance of it he had delivered before the Nashville Mechanics' Association, on the Fourth of July, 1832. The strikingly original views set forth in this Discourse he was in the habit of advancing on all proper occasions—in the lecture-room, in the popular assembly, on the commencement stage, and through

the newspapers. Sometimes he even broached them in the pulpit. Amongst his ablest and longest extemporaneous discourses, was one on *Oaths and Elections*, another on *Banking and the Currency*, another on *University Education and the Learning of the Egyptians*. When invited to deliver public lectures and addresses, as he often was, before literary and religious societies, and even on Fourth of July occasions, he always availed himself of the opportunity to instruct the people, rather than to gratify mere curiosity. He was sure to call their attention to some important practical question of moral, social and political science. He never wasted any ammunition on mere rhetoric and speculation. He was a man of facts and figures, and never spoke except with the consciousness of accurate knowledge. It was always the heavy ordnance of strong thought, and the hard metal of fact, argument and common sense which he aimed to wield. And we never knew or heard of an instance, during the period of twenty-five years, in which any man ever succeeded in pointing out a fallacy in his arguments, a mistake as to his main facts, or the slightest blunder or inaccuracy in his scholarship.

If it should occur to any reader of his Discourse on American Democracy that he has there exalted the vocation of the farmer, mechanic and teacher, above that of the learned professions of law, medicine and divinity, it will be enough to say, that it is only in appearance so. It cannot be, that one whose great labour of life was to infuse into the young a love of all high and liberal learning, should be wanting in respect for the legal, medical and ministerial classes. It is true that he at times spoke disparagingly of lawyers and divines, especially the latter; but at such times, it was only of those who by ignorance and stupidity, or worse errors, had disgraced their high and sacred offices—of which class there are unfortunately but too many examples in every age. His noble Plea for Princeton Seminary stands as a sufficient vindication of his own high appreciation of the importance and the sacred character of the gospel ministry. No man could well have a higher conception of its true representatives, or a deeper abhorrence of its mere smatterers and usurpers. The reader will also find a noble tribute to the medical fraternity in his Address

on Temperance. And as for the legal profession, he repels the charge of being wanting in due respect, in the following magnificent passage, worthy of the best pages of Bacon and Milton, taken from one of his Educational Discourses:—

“I cherish no unkindly sentiment towards lawyers. So long as the Gothic-Saxo-Norman-English system of common, statute and bench-made law, which has been represented as an interminable, overgrown, incomprehensible, labyrinthian mystery of torture, and extortion—which Burke deliberately denounced, which Brougham is diligently labouring to reform, and which Bentham is intrepidly threatening to annihilate:—or, (to speak the language of Blackstone and others,) so long as this intricate and beautiful science, the very perfection of written reason, to the lucid development of which, the most indefatigable and distinguished sages have nobly consecrated their talents and their lives—so long as this much lauded and much vituperated system, whether it be law, science, mystery, or all combined, to which every known epithet of praise and censure has been and continues to be applied, and of which it is impossible for the uninitiated, like myself, to form any conception, except from its practical effects—so long as such a system, whatever may be its qualities or tendencies, shall find favour in our land, *lawyers* will be the oracles of truth, wisdom and justice to the people. Lawyers too there must be, under any form of government or system of jurisprudence. And a truly accomplished, liberal, upright, high-minded lawyer will ever prove a most valuable blessing and the brightest ornament to any community. Of many such eminently gifted and illustrious jurists and advocates our country may proudly boast. It is for the people to decide, whether they will consent to be the passive slaves and dupes of mere pettifogging smatterers, by becoming themselves sufficiently intelligent, to detect and to discountenance every species of knavish quackery.”

The range of topics discussed by him in this volume, aside from his Educational Discourses, will be sufficient to show how far beyond the ordinary province of the theologian, Dr. Lindsley had extended his reading and his researches. It serves to illustrate also, the great versatility of his mental powers. He acquired knowledge with the

utmost facility. Study was his delight, his pastime, and with his remarkably acute, original and comprehensive intellect, there can be no question that he could have reached the highest rank in either of the learned professions, or on the broader arena of politics and statesmanship, had his attention been directed to them instead of the ministry and the teacher's office. He might have graced the senate chamber, the bench of justice or the chair of state. It was certainly best as it was. Man deviseth his way, but the Lord directeth his steps.

It is singular that he should never have received the title of LL.D. from any of our American colleges, generally so lavish of their honours. It serves to show with what little discrimination and regard to real learning these titles are conferred, that one so pre-eminently entitled to it by all his studies and attainments, should not have received it even from his *Alma Mater*. Nassau Hall might well have been proud to place such a son on the catalogue of her Doctors of Law. Certainly no man has appeared in the ranks of the American clergy, either of the Presbyterian or any other church, who had a profounder acquaintance with Canon and Civil Law, except perhaps those who were once lawyers. He held the whole matter of degrees, however, as now managed, in much indifference, and rarely conferred any while at Nashville except upon resident and well-known ministers.*

* By-the-way, we find among his papers the following amusing "Advertisement," entitled—

"COLLEGE DOCTORATES."

Whereas, the undersigned has, for many years past, been grievously worried by applications for the Doctorate, from various parts of Europe and America: now therefore be it known unto all whom it may concern, that henceforth no attention will be paid to any such application unless accompanied by at least *one hundred dollars*, as a small consideration for the trouble imposed and for the signal favour expected. The said hundred dollars (or more) will be regarded as a *substantial* qualification, and a far more *reliable* testimonial than is usually furnished. The M.D. will not be granted, on like terms, to any candidate, without satisfactory bond and security that he will not engage in the practice of medicine in consequence, or by virtue of such degree. Newspapers throughout the world will, no doubt, oblige many a reader, including not a few editors, by publishing the above liberal notice.—P. L.

VI. HIS ARTICLES FOR THE PRESS.

The press was always regarded by Dr. Lindsley as a very important agency to be used in carrying forward all his great educational schemes. Like Doctor Franklin, he was in the habit of availing himself of this method of enlightening the public mind in reference to whatever subjects he deemed of public interest. In one form or another, and at different times, a large proportion of the matter comprised in the present volumes was given to the public through the newspapers of the day. He adopted this course before he removed to Nashville, and followed it up during the long period of his connection with the University. While at Princeton, he published in the *Trenton Emporium* a series of essays, signed "Hermit," touching the contemplated resuscitation of "Queen's College," afterwards Rutger's College, at New Brunswick, in which he advanced many of the striking, and, at that time, original views and suggestions which form the basis of his Inaugural Address at Nashville. He published also in the Nashville papers, at different times, two series of articles,—one on Popular Education and another on Common Schools,—both of which, as to their substance of fact and illustration, he also gave to the public in the form of Baccalaureate Addresses and printed pamphlets. So also with his able lecture on Popular Education, now published in the first volume of his works. It was spread before the people in a style adapted to his purpose—in the columns of a weekly newspaper.

He certainly acted the part of wisdom and of patriotism in this. His object being to enlighten the public mind on the whole subject of education, both liberal and popular, he availed himself of every opportunity to reach the people, through the pulpit, the press, the commencement stage and the popular assembly. And he appeared to feel that his work was not fully done, until he had taken the elaborate oration and the learned lecture and condensed them into short, pointed and readable newspaper articles.

It has not been thought advisable to republish any of these articles, as the reader will find the substance of them in his Addresses and Dis-

courses. But a few articles of another kind have been presented in this volume. They were occasional and fugitive pieces, not intended, like the other class, to discuss grave and important questions of public interest, but to call attention to certain popular errors, prejudices, extravagancies or follies. These were often full of wit and sarcasm. As a writer and as a speaker, he knew both how to be grave and how to be gay. Few men knew better how to shoot folly as it flies. The pieces now published, though the occasions which called them forth have passed away, can hardly fail to be read with interest and amusement. They reveal a power of sarcasm, a depth of wit and humour, an idiomatic edge of expression, and a command of all the resources of irony and invective, which his position and character led him for the most part to restrain, but which, when he found a fitting occasion and a justifying cause, would sometimes find vent in a way not easily forgotten by those who had provoked it; and which led some, who saw him for the first time on the floor of debate in our church courts, and only in this character, to call him the Dean Swift of the body. He could, and he sometimes did, in public meetings at Nashville, when unjustly misrepresented or assailed, pour forth such a stream of fact, anecdote, argument and good-natured ridicule, as to convulse his audience with laughter and overwhelm every opponent. But it is easy to see, even if there were no other evidence, that the power which could pen these amusing sketches for a morning newspaper, might readily, on occasion, wield an artillery of speech, before which it would be difficult for the imprudent and the vulnerable to stand.*

* As an illustration of this style, take the following paragraphs from his article entitled "Horrid Robbery and Murder."

"I have been cozened, defrauded, bamboozled and swindled out of more precious time, by all sorts of honest men and rogues, than would have sufficed a master genius, like myself, to compose the Iliad or Paradise Lost, or to have liberated the Poles or conquered China. I will specify but one mode, among the many, by which this irreparable mischief has been inflicted. I belong to sundry companies, clubs, corporations, societies, boards and institutions—the members of which are required to meet for the gratuitous transaction of busi-

VII. ECCLESIASTICAL RELATIONS.

The ancestry of Dr. Lindsley, which, according to the family tradition, may be traced back through seven generations to Colonel Francis Lindsley, who left England with his family about 1680–85, on account of religious persecution, and settled in New Jersey, seems to have been remarkable for piety and for their adherence to the Presbyterian faith. The family became an extended one, branching off into New England and Pennsylvania. John Lindsley, the son of Francis, and sixth ancestor of Dr. Philip Lindsley, settled in Morristown, N. J., about the opening of the eighteenth century, and gave to the Presbyterian Church of that place the burying-ground, church site and village green. The family were all whigs during the Revolution, and they have, through all generations, as a general rule, been decided Presbyterians. Dr. John M. Stevenson states, in his funeral discourse,

ness at certain places and at stated hours. Of course, I am always punctually at my post—but there I must wait, and wait, and wait in vain, for a quorum. Another meeting must be called in consequence—and, for the like failure, another,—and perhaps another. Thus am I compelled to go four times, and to waste two or three hours each time, in order to do the business of half an hour! And when a *quorum* do get together, it is usually at least an hour after the time appointed—and this again I must lose. From this one cause I have lost, on an average, three hours a week, for the last seven years—which is 156 hours a year, or 1092 hours in seven years—which, at twelve working hours a day, amounts to 91 days. If to this one item be added all other similar losses occasioned by the want of punctuality in others in regard to the every day concerns of life—the sum total could not be less than one year in seven. So much of my life has been nullified—destroyed—annihilated.

“I have been robbed of all the money which I might have earned in that time—of all the knowledge which I might have acquired—of all the great and good and wonderful things which I might have achieved in that time. In a word, my life has been thus much curtailed. I have been murdered by inches, and am still being murdered—I am stretched upon the rack—am burning at the stake—starving in a dungeon—and thus have been for years and years and years—so that I have scarcely found leisure for anything more than a sorry newspaper paragraph—for which I always get more kicks than coppers.”

that the records of the Morristown church, to which he had access, mention seven ruling elders of this branch of the family, within a period of sixty years, from 1747 to 1805; and that at least fourteen of the whole dispersed family had been permitted to preach the glorious gospel, while several of them have occupied responsible stations in the colleges and seminaries of our land. Very similar is the record of his maternal ancestors, the Condicts, or Condits, who came over from England, and settled in New Jersey about the same time with the Lindsleys.

Thus descended from a staunch Presbyterian stock, and educated in the bosom of the church of his fathers, Dr. Lindsley was through life a steadfast adherent to her standards, and an uncompromising advocate of sound doctrine and order. His faith had been firmly anchored in childhood to this rock of truth, and it was never loosened by any of the prevailing speculations, hobbies, philosophies and fancied improvements of the times. At the same time, as we have had occasion to state in another place, while standing thus unmoved on old-fashioned Presbyterianism, he ever breathed a spirit of the widest liberality and charity towards all other branches of the Christian Church. No man could go beyond him in this brotherly kindness. But this, at times, led some, not fully informed as to his views, to misunderstand his true position. Especially was this the case at the time of the great conflict of opinion and final division in the Presbyterian Church, when, as the result showed, though apparently neutral between the parties at the beginning, he was, and always had been, on the side of sound orthodoxy and order. Here, however, he only stood in the same category with many of the ablest and best men in the church.

Owing perhaps to his vocation as a teacher, and to his not holding the office of pastor, he was not, at least while in Tennessee, a constant attendant upon, nor a frequent speaker in, the meetings of Presbytery and Synod. It is to be regretted that he did not take a more active and controlling share in these deliberations of the lower church courts. It is a door of influence, which one, situated as he was, is very apt to forego; but still it is an opening for good and an instrument of power, which every minister, who has the knowledge and talent to use it to

advantage, ought never to neglect. Still he did attend upon many of these assemblies, and sometimes took an important part in their proceedings. This was the case when the Synod met at Huntsville, Alabama, in 1839, when the New-School party separated from that body, and protested against its action. Here he took a leading part in the deliberations, as a conservative Old-School man. He was on the committee appointed to answer the protest of the seceders, and, as we learn from a copy on record in his journal, was the writer of the paper. He at first tried to unite the parties and prevent any division, but failed in this. He also attended the meeting at Florence, Alabama, in 1844, and at Clarksville, Tennessee, in 1845, where he was the Moderator. The meetings of Synod nearer home he attended, and more frequently those of Presbytery.

He was a member of four different General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church—first, that of 1819, at Philadelphia, as the alternate of Dr. Green; then of 1834, over which he was Moderator; next of 1846, both at Philadelphia; and finally of 1855, at Nashville, during the sessions of which he died. It may be interesting to state a few facts, touching his position in the Assembly of 1834.

It was his first visit to the East, after an absence of ten years. He had given himself up wholly, during this time, to his great work in Tennessee, and had almost lost sight of ecclesiastical affairs at the East. In the mean time the lines had become more and more distinctly drawn between the Old and New-School parties in the church. It was in the Assembly of 1834 that the first great conflict between these parties assumed the form of an open and uncompromising issue, involving the very essentials of faith and order, at least in the judgment of the Old School. The New School had the majority in the Assembly, as was made manifest by its sustaining the complaint and appeal of the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia against the Synod, and by its action on the Western Memorial. On the one side, there was a struggle for the mastery, in order to sustain the new doctrines and the men who endorsed them. On the other, there was a fixed determination to stand by the old landmarks of the faith once delivered to the saints. It was accordingly, while one of the most important, one

of the most exciting Assemblies which had ever met; and its sessions were protracted through almost three weeks.

Such was the composition and temper of the body over which Dr. Lindsley was called to preside, with scarcely any previous acquaintance as to the actual position of affairs, and, as we have seen, with but little experience in the tactics of ecclesiastical bodies. He was elected Moderator unanimously, and by acclamation—no one else being nominated. Doubtless he was taken by surprise, and finding himself in so unusual and difficult a position, he determined to make the best of it, by discharging his duty with that urbanity and scholarly bearing which marked all his conduct, and that impartial justice which the occasion demanded. Under such circumstances it would have been difficult to give entire satisfaction to both parties, perhaps to either.

The following interesting correspondence with Rev. Isaac V. Brown, D.D., one of his early friends and a leading member of that Assembly, appeared in the newspapers soon after Dr. Lindsley's death, in 1855. It shows very clearly where he stood and how he felt. The allusion referred to in his letter, which Dr. Brown had made in a previous communication, was in these words, speaking of the Assembly of 1834: "I could not tell from your action as Moderator, to which side you inclined in the strife; and I have never met with any evidence to guide my judgment since. But I never doubted that your feelings were with the orthodox."

NEW ALBANY, May 3, 1855.

REVEREND AND DEAR SIR:—I duly received and carefully read your very able "Historical Vindication," etc., for which I beg you to accept my most grateful acknowledgments. Such a work was greatly needed by the present generation, and probably, by not a few like myself, of the past. I anticipate, and wish for it, the widest possible circulation, among our churches and people.

The allusion in your last letter, to my position in 1834, may justify a single remark. When I left Princeton in 1824, I soon found myself so completely absorbed in local and professional matters, as to lose sight of our ecclesiastical and theological controversies in the East. On arriving at Philadelphia, as a commissioner to the Assembly of

1834, I was as nearly ignorant of the state of parties, the bias of individuals, and the precise grounds of dissension, as if I had just dropped from the moon. Among other queer things I soon learned that Drs. Ely and Spring had changed sides, and were regarded as champions of doctrines and measures directly opposed to their former course, etc. etc. I was not a little surprised and mystified by what I daily witnessed. As I had no kind mentor at hand to enlighten me, I resolved to go by the Book, without fear, favour, or affection.

I have always been, as I still am, a Presbyterian, according to the obvious import of our time-honoured standards.

But as I hope soon to see you and to have the pleasure of talking over the scenes and events of bygone years, I will not trouble you further at present.

Very truly and respectfully yours, etc.

P. LINDSLEY.

REV. ISAAC V. BROWN.

TRENTON, July 13, 1855.

DEAR SIR:—In looking over the recent correspondence I have had with the late Dr. Lindsley, I fixed my eye upon the preceding, probably one of the last letters Dr. Lindsley ever wrote to a distant friend,—particularly as it explains his position and character theologically to the day of his sudden and lamented departure. As he was a man of very superior talents and attainments; standing in the highest grade among the literary, accomplished and eloquent men of the present century, I feel a pure gratification in this, his dying declaration, which authorizes us to place him among the truly orthodox members and devoted friends of our beloved church. At some future day, it will certainly be proper to give some detailed account of the character, life, and labours of our illustrious departed brother.

With great respect and esteem, dear sir, as ever, etc.

ISAAC V. BROWN.

REV. DR. MCKINNEY, *Editor of Presbyterian Banner.*

In reference to the foregoing letter, to which Dr. Brown had called our attention, he remarks in a communication just received as we were

preparing the present memoir, "I am pleased to find that you have obtained Dr. Lindsley's letter to which I referred you. It is the most important document for your purpose, in my knowledge. Dr. L. was calm, decisive yet impartial, through the whole of the tempestuous sessions of the General Assembly of 1834, which lasted three weeks, and was a scene of unceasing conflicts."

Although he had thus in his office of Moderator over an Assembly of the whole church, acted with such even-handed impartiality that his intimate friends could not tell which way he inclined, still, when the issue was made up, and the final division effected in 1838, there was no indecision or hesitation as to his position. He took his stand firmly with the Old School in his own Presbytery and Synod, as was fully evinced in the decisive action of the latter at Huntsville in 1839. Conservative as he was in all things, and utterly opposed to fruitless speculation and innovation in theology, he could not have done otherwise.

VIII. REMOVAL FROM NASHVILLE.

It has not been our aim to tell the story of Dr. Lindsley's life by narrating events in their chronological order, but to single out certain prominent periods as landmarks along the way, and to fill up the intervals between, by grouping together his chief studies, attainments, pursuits and characteristics at each epoch, so as to supply what was wanting to the two preceding sketches. Of course we need not stop now to speak of his great life-work at Nashville, as an educator, filling up the twenty-six years of his presidency in the University, or of his ministerial character and labours during that long period. These we have already attempted to describe in the two former volumes. It remains only to touch upon a few points of interest, connected with his resignation of the presidency, and removal to another field of labour, at a time of life when it might have seemed more congenial to his feelings to remain where he was, and repose on the trophies of the past. At this period he had nearly reached the age of sixty-four. His intellect was active and vigorous, and his studies were still pursued with much of the ardour of youth. But for some years back, at times his health had given way, and under the weight of recent

bereavements in the family circle, though his eye was not dimmed in the least, his physical strength was somewhat impaired.

We have seen with what reluctance, even after a long struggle, he had torn himself away from Princeton in 1824. To this painful separation was probably owing the fact that he never saw it again, though he visited the East many times during a period of thirty years. Still more trying must have been his removal from Nashville. There all his largest plans had been laid, and all his best energies exerted for the public good. There some of his children were already married and settled in life. There the strongest social ties had been formed with many faithful friends, who for twenty-six years had borne with him the heat and burden of the day. And there too, recently made, were the graves of the dearest objects of his heart. All his interests were closely identified with the place and people, and until the combination of circumstances occurred which led finally to his removal, he had probably, for many years, entertained no other thought than to spend the remnant of his days there. To those at a distance who knew all the facts of his history, it seemed that Nashville could better have spared any one else of her citizens. And to those who rightly appreciated both him and the city, it seemed a matter of regret that he should not have laboured on, even to the close of life, at the post he had held so long.

It is not our purpose here to enter into any detailed account of the causes which led to the separation. That may be safely left to the future historian of the University. All that is necessary now is simply to state some of the more prominent circumstances in view of which he was induced, after so long, laborious and successful a career, to leave the city of his adoption and enter upon another department of the work of instruction elsewhere. It often occurs that the ablest and best men, under an unexpected, perhaps unavoidable combination of circumstances, are led to give up fields of usefulness, which all others may think them best qualified to fill; and in such cases, while we wonder at the change, we are reconciled to it only in the belief that an All-wise Providence is thus accomplishing some greater good.

In 1849, in order to carry out certain views which he had long

cherished, Dr. Lindsley drew up and submitted to the Board of Trustees a Plan for organizing and sustaining the University, differing essentially from the former one. It was somewhat analogous to the one adopted at the University of Virginia. The Board cordially acceded to his views, and determined to adopt the Plan as soon as practicable. The rapid extension of the city, however, in the immediate vicinity of the old buildings, rendered it necessary to erect new ones in another and more suitable quarter, and to close the University for a short season, until this change could be made. It was thought that the reopening of the institution, in its new buildings, and on more commodious grounds, farther out from the city, would be a favourable time at which to inaugurate the new and larger plans proposed by the President. The fall of 1850 was fixed upon as the time for these changes.

So far as the University was concerned, it seemed important that he should remain at his post, in order to carry out these plans. So far also as its past history or present condition was concerned, there was no reason why he should have retired. In April, 1850, a committee of the Board of Trustees, appointed for the purpose, published in the Nashville papers a full statement of its financial condition, and of its general history and progress from 1824 to that time. From that document it appeared, that the funds of the institution, small at the beginning, had, by judicious investment and economical management, especially during the five years immediately preceding, so increased and appreciated, that it was then worth from 115,000 to 140,000 dollars over and above all indebtedness. It also appeared, that during this whole period of Dr. Lindsley's presidency, the number of students had been larger than in any other college in Tennessee, considering that there never had been any preparatory department in the University, and that two-thirds of its students always belonged to the two higher classes. It further appeared, that the last six graduating classes, from 1843 to 1849 inclusive, had been larger than any other six classes together that had ever graduated there—thus demonstrating a steady increase, not only of funds, but of efficiency, to the last—and that, too, notwithstanding two successive visitations of cholera in the

city, in 1848 and 1849, and the lamented death thereby of one of its oldest and ablest professors, Mr. James Hamilton.

But, as already stated, it had become necessary to change the site, erect new buildings and close the University for a season. In the mean time, that is, in the spring of 1850, the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary at New Albany, Indiana, had created a new professorship in that institution, and unanimously elected Dr. Lindsley to the chair. About a year before, April, 1849, he had married at New Albany, Mrs. Mary Ann Ayers, the widow of his kinsman, Elias Ayers, the founder of the Seminary. In the summer of 1850, Dr. Girard Troost, another old and distinguished professor, who had served with him twenty-two years in the University, also died. All these circumstances taken together had their influence; and, in connection with some other things occurring at the same time, which need not be mentioned now, he was induced to remove to New Albany. At the urgent solicitation, however, of the Board of Trustees, and of a large senior class in the University, who expected to graduate in the fall, and would be greatly disappointed to lose his lectures, he remained to the close of the collegiate year, October 2, 1850. His last public service in the University was a discourse at that Commencement, on the Life and Character of his old associate, Dr. Troost. And thus closed one of the most laborious, important and successful presidencies as yet recorded in the annals of American colleges. It is not always that our rising institutions, especially in the West and South, have been able to secure a labourer and a governor so faithful, so persevering, and so accomplished. It is not often that a city, such as Nashville was in 1824, has had the good fortune to obtain the presence and the influence of one who comprehended so well the problem of her highest good, and who strove so earnestly and so long to put her in possession of it.

IX. HIS WORK AT NEW ALBANY.

Dr. Lindsley removed to New Albany in December, 1850. The professorship in the Theological Seminary at that place, to which he had been elected the preceding April, was a new one, created by the Board of Directors at that time, and entitled the Chair of Ecclesias-

tical Polity and Biblical Archæology. From the foregoing sketch it will be seen how eminently fitted he was, by his past studies, for that position. Archæology, History and Government had been the subjects of his critical research and his constant reading from a very early period. He at once, with the opening of the year 1851, commenced his course of lectures on the subjects of his department. He was not, however, formally inaugurated in his new office till the thirteenth of November following, when he delivered an address, a copy of which was requested by the Board for publication, and the substance of which will be found among the works now published.

As stated already, in the brief record of his life, given in our introduction to the first of these volumes, he did not hold this professorship to the time of his death, in 1855. He in fact tendered his resignation to the Board at three different times: first in July, 1852; again in April, 1853, when it was proposed to transfer the institution to the General Assembly; and finally in April, 1854, when it was reluctantly accepted by the Board of Directors.

The following communication from one of his colleagues in the Seminary at New Albany, Rev. Dr. Stewart, addressed to us under date of September 12, 1860, from Camden, New Jersey, will sufficiently illustrate his character and attainments at this closing period of life. The memoir referred to is the introductory sketch in the first volume:—

REVEREND AND DEAR SIR:—I received by post your brief memoir of Dr. P. Lindsley, and have read it with great interest. It has served to recall to my mind many pleasing memories of that eminent Christian gentleman and scholar, with whom it was my happiness to be associated during a few of his latter years.

I became acquainted with Dr. Lindsley in the year 1850, soon after he had formed a matrimonial alliance with Mrs. Ayers, a lady well known for her Christian liberality and esteemed for her many social virtues. The Board of Directors of the New Albany Theological Seminary had extended to him an invitation to occupy one of the chairs of instruction in that institution, which led to his immediate removal

from Nashville to this place, where he spent the closing years of his useful life. It was apparent to all who saw him for the first time, that increasing years and cares had weighed upon his physical nature; but the briefest acquaintance made it equally apparent, that his mind had lost nothing of its activity and vigour.

As it respects Dr. Lindsley's relations to the Theological Seminary, they were of the most pleasant and agreeable character. He was highly esteemed by his associates for his great urbanity and polished scholarship, which were conspicuous at all times and in all places; and greatly respected and beloved by the students who received his instructions. But, from circumstances connected with the affairs of that institution, and from the indefinite character of the duties which devolved on him as an instructor, he made no special effort to inaugurate a course of exact study. His lectures were somewhat discursive, always interesting, but probably not such as he would have delivered at an earlier period of his life. During his connection with the Seminary there was little or nothing to stimulate or encourage. The number of students was small and constantly decreasing, its resources extremely limited, and a general apathy had seized upon its friends. All this Dr. Lindsley was not slow to perceive, and consequently he felt that his relations to it as an instructor could have no great permanency. It is known to the writer of this that his professional mantle sat loosely on him, and that he stood ready at any moment to lay it aside. There was, in these circumstances, scarcely any opportunity to bring his well-trained mind as an educator to bear upon the interests of theological instruction. It is, therefore, to a former period of his career that we must look for the controlling influence which he exerted on the interests of education in all its bearings.

But, out of sight of the public, in the more limited sphere of private friendship, it was constantly apparent how richly stored was his mind with useful and varied learning, and how well fitted he was to impart these treasures to others. It was here that his tastes and mental characteristics came out into distinct view. While thoroughly versed in theology, and conversant with the metaphysical distinctions of the schools, his decided preference lay in the direction of the natural

sciences and general literature in their relations to the volume of Revelation. He manifested but little inclination for mere theological discussion. He could never be a zealous polemic. While warmly attached to the system of doctrine received by his own denomination, he embraced with affection the whole Evangelical Church. His catholic spirit led him to magnify the points of agreement, rather than the points of difference, between the various branches of the Church of God. It was, however, towards science, in its modern development as affecting the great interests of religion, that his thoughts were most frequently turned. In the study of this he felt the deepest interest, especially in its bearings on theological instruction. He saw that here was the stronghold of modern infidelity, and that it was of first-rate importance that those set for the defence of the truth should be thoroughly fortified at this point. There was nothing of any value, written or published, on this general subject, which he had not read; and on all points where science and Christianity touched, his views were clear and fixed. His opinions were the result of much reflection, and on all points they occupied the high ground of Christian conservatism. It was refreshing to observe how far his appreciative mind was removed from the dogmatism of the mere student of science, who has never sat at the feet of the Great Teacher, as from that of the student of theology who has never listened to the utterances of nature. His humble bearing was not less striking than his profound learning.

Nor was it on account of any mere novelty in the views and opinions which marked the more recent publications in the various departments of natural science, that he read with so much avidity. Scarcely anything was produced, during these latter years of his life, in the way of removing the objections and difficulties which science had raised against Revelation, which had not already been the subject of serious reflection in his own mind, and, in several instances, of written discourse. Nothing seemed new to him; yet nothing was without interest. Whatever reached the public eye, through the press, in any way connected with Physical Geography, Geology and Ethnology, was subjected to the closest scrutiny, and made to contribute to the entertainment and profit of those who enjoyed the pleasure of his society;

and, not unfrequently, these seemed only as the occasion for the resuscitation of thoughts that had been slumbering in his own mind. In a conversation, which turned on the unity of the human race, reference was made to a work recently published, which accounted for the existing diversity among the different nations by attributing this diversity to the dispersion which took place at Babel. He not only gave his approval of the theory, but furnished the evidence, that he himself had years before given publicity to the same opinion. He felt all the weakness of the theory of the distinguished Prichard, which attempts to explain this diversity of colour on climatic principles—a view which has recently been reproduced by more than one writer—but which, in the light of the incontestable fact, that the Ethiopian was as black in the days of Moses as at the present day, and the very slender evidence furnished by the great English ethnologist, that white men ever become black, he was led to reject as utterly untenable. His mind rested on the great biblical fact, as offering the only satisfactory explanation of this difficult problem, and, at the same time, the best answer to the attacks of science, falsely so called.

In this familiar intercourse, Dr. Lindsley's conversation was always instructive; his mind seemed to be continually overflowing with the accumulations of past years or was marked by great versatility, his thoughts passing from topic to topic without any apparent effort; his familiarity with the men and measures of his own day, with ancient and modern literature, with all forms of educational appliances enabled him to adapt his discourse to the society in which he was thrown. He was never at a loss, always ready to make himself agreeable to all—to those advanced in years like himself, deferential; to the young, entertaining; with a courtesy which never transcended the limits of good taste, he used his own matured knowledge to correct the imperfections of those who waited on his instruction; and, without assuming the air of a censor, pointed out and corrected many a fault. His knowledge of the English language, its idioms, its peculiarities, its pronunciation, was of the most exact character. His ear was so delicately attuned to the niceties of sound that he observed every defective utterance, and in a way for which many will thank him, suggested

the proper mode. In this respect, Dr. Lindsley was a model instructor; and I have often thought it would be a happy circumstance if our young men who are preparing for the learned professions, and especially such as are to occupy the pulpit, could enjoy the supervision of just such a careful observer—one whose instructions, instead of being confined to the lecture-room, would, in the same authoritative but courteous manner, be delivered in the social circle. It is needless to say how often the educated ear is offended while listening to the discourses of many, high in the public estimation, simply for the lack of this. But it is seldom one meets with a mind so completely educated in this respect as was Dr. Lindsley's.

It was in the social circle that his powers of conversation found the widest scope. Genial and fond of society, he loved the company of his friends, and during the few years of his sojourn in New Albany the residence of Dr. Lindsley and his estimable lady was the centre of many delightful reunions. These were much enlivened by the Doctor's animated conversation—a talent which he possessed to a rare degree, and which would have made him conspicuous in any circle. His memory at this period, less retentive than it had been once, betrayed him occasionally into repetitions, but at all times there was a sincerity and earnestness, together with a freshness of thought, which commanded respect and attention. He did not talk merely to pass away time, it was with him a real pleasure, and he seemed to throw his whole soul into the subject which occupied his thoughts as much at times as if he were discoursing to a class in the lecture-room.

But the crowning ornament of his fine character was the ripe fruits of simple confiding faith in the word of God. In his mind the things difficult and hard to be understood were as easy of belief as the simplest and plainest utterances of inspiration. Its grand truths stood out before him as facts not to be questioned—difficult of comprehension, but as true as any fact in the natural world. His piety was of the most child-like type. There was nothing like cant or affected sanctity about him, but a profound veneration for things sacred or divine shone out in his whole life. His supplications at a throne of grace were fervent and devout, and no one could listen to his simple

and solemn utterances in prayer without feeling that he was drawing near to his Father's house.

Years have passed away since I went in and out at his hospitable door. Many things have been obliterated from my memory, but I shall never forget his grave, earnest, and scholar-like countenance, always beaming with intelligence, his gentle and winning manners and the warmth of his salutations. He was confiding and unsuspecting; I never knew him to speak harshly or in terms of unkindness to any one; the charity which thinketh no evil, constituted a large element in his character. I knew him only to love and esteem him for his great worth; his memory I cherish with feelings akin to filial affection; and on the pile which you have thrown up to his memory, let me drop this pebble picked up at the ebb-tide of his existence.

Yours, etc.,

DAN'L STEWART.

X. DOMESTIC AND SOCIAL RELATIONS.

In the fragmentary and imperfect memoir which we have here given, it will not be necessary to say much on a topic of this kind. Our purpose being mainly to delineate Dr. Lindsley's character in his public and official relations, to describe his educational and ministerial labours, and the varied studies and attainments which distinguished him as a writer and public speaker, thus far we have not had occasion to venture within the sanctuary of home and the family circle, to speak distinctly of the social and religious affections which are brought to view in the foregoing letter. No character, however, can be adequately or even justly portrayed without some reference to this point. Nothing indeed is more interesting and instructive than to follow the good man from the busy labours of official station or the silent vigils of mental toil, to the retreats of private affection, where he unbends and disports himself in the bosom of his family. It is not often that the great bustling world without has any conception of what is going on, in the way of genial and loving sympathy, in these home sanctuaries of the scholar and man of letters. No men on earth are probably so little understood and so often misrepresented as those who spend their lives in study. For no better reason than that they are silent and thoughtful in a crowd, they are often regarded as exclusive and unsocial.

There was, no doubt, an impression of this sort in the minds of some persons, respecting Dr. Lindsley. But it was a mistake. It would have been impossible, in the nature of things, for any man to give as much time as he did to study, and to accomplish the amount of reading and writing which he accomplished, and yet not appear at times reserved and uncommunicative to persons little given to such pursuits themselves. But in every congenial and appreciative circle no man was fonder of the interchange of thought and feeling, and none more excelled in conversational powers. He had no gift, and no great admiration for the chatty nonsense, of what is sometimes called good society, but it needed only an intellectual, cultivated company of friends, and the stimulus of an important theme, and there was at once the unrestrained flow of eloquent, brilliant, sparkling speech, as from a perennial, inexhaustible fountain. On every such occasion, he became, as a matter of course, the chief speaker; and when the scene was his own fire-side or social board, his guests not unfrequently retired, wondering how the time had fled. Many an intelligent stranger too, meeting him for the first time on some of his travels, and thrown for a few days into his company, has left him, only to regret that he could not know more of one so full of all useful knowledge, and so gifted in the power of imparting it.

But his home was his Eden, and except when invaded by disease, or overshadowed by death, there was everything in it to make life peaceful and joyous. Few men perhaps have ever had a more genial and happy home; for few could have been more blest in the companionship of his early choice, and in the children of their mutual love. From some indications already given, in the notice of his early years, it might be inferred that he possessed, in a high degree, those social qualities and susceptibilities which are so well calculated to impart and to receive happiness in the domestic circle. And accordingly we find, through all the relationships of life, repeated evidences of that intense and ardent affection which first showed itself in the love of a noble mother. Some of these examples are so touching and beautiful that we shall be pardoned for introducing them here, as illustrations of his social and religious character.

In all his trips to the East, he had ever made it a point of duty to visit his mother, in New Jersey, as long as she lived. We find the following record of her decease in his journal for 1854:—

“*January 30.*—I this day received a letter informing me of the decease of my beloved and ever-honoured mother. She died at Madison, Morris County, New Jersey, on Friday, January 20, 1854, about five o’clock P.M. Had she lived two months longer, she would have completed eighty-six years. She was born March 21, 1763. Having lived a most exemplary and useful Christian life, she departed in peace, and in the full assurance of a blessed immortality.

“*March 4.*—I have just read the 135th number of the *American Messenger* for March of the present year. In it I read with intense interest the following communication:—

[For the *American Messenger*.]

““WHAT WILL OUR CHILDREN THINK OF US WHEN THEY ARE OLD? —A venerable widow, now eighty-five, has but a dim recollection even of her own children, but a scene in the life of her father is still vividly before her. He was an officer in the army of the Revolution, and, believing it necessary to be inoculated for the small-pox, before subjecting himself to the disease, he visited his home. He gathered his family around the domestic altar, and solemnly commended them to God, and then took leave of them—not knowing but it would be, as it proved to be, his last earthly meeting with those dear ones. As he was leaving the house, this daughter, his youngest child, followed him out upon the porch. He turned back, took her in his arms, kissed and fervently blessed her, and departed. She never saw him again; but that kiss and that blessing are now as fresh as though of yesterday. This scene she often recounts with the tears streaming down her cheeks. Next to the memory of her Saviour, she delights in the memory of her father. The burdens of age are lightened by such recollections. Parents, what are we tracing of ourselves upon the memory of our children? What will our children think of us when *they* are old?”

“Who was the writer of the above I know not; but the subject of it was my sainted mother. Often have I heard the story from her own affectionate lips. That last sad interview with her father seemed

ever present to her mind. She told me all about him when I was a little child—how good he was—and how dearly she loved him. My last visit to her was in October, 1852. I passed some ten days at her house, in Madison, New Jersey. She then repeated to me the parting scene with her father, as quoted from the *Messenger*. Colonel Ebenezer Condict, her father, died of small-pox, in camp, April 2, 1777, near Mendham—Washington's headquarters being at Morristown. My mother was nine years old, and her father about forty."

In this connection, we may add another interesting record, taken from a foregoing page:—

"My mother often saw General Washington while the army had their winter quarters at Morristown and vicinity, and she retains a distinct recollection of his appearance, manners, etc. He occasionally visited at her mother's house, where was quartered General Gist, of the Maryland line. He sometimes dined there. He often amused himself with her as a playful child—spoke kind words to her about her father, whom he highly esteemed, and whose recent death (by small-pox in camp) he deeply deplored. She became greatly attached to him. His benevolent, affectionate, pleasant manner won her confidence, and caused her to forget the warrior in the friend. She mentioned numerous little events and incidents characteristic of the *good* man—such as a child nine or ten years old would be likely to notice and to be impressed with. She was present in the old Presbyterian Church at Morristown, when General Washington partook of the Lord's Supper with the Rev. Dr. Timothy Johnes and his people, as narrated by Dr. Hosack in his *Life of De Witt Clinton*. (See also Barber and Howe's *Historical Collections of New Jersey*, p. 388.) She described to me, with minute particularity and accuracy, the localities, seats, tables, persons present and officiating—differing much from present modes and forms, but corresponding exactly with the usages of that day, and of the early period within my own memory.

"She remarked that she had never seen a good—that is, a correct likeness of Washington. Perhaps her opinion would have been different, had she ever beheld the general at the head of his troops or on the battle-field. The portraits are all too grave, solemn, warlike, to

accord with the smiling, cheerful, benignant countenance of the social guest and orphan's friend—as she had known and loved him.

“The American army, under Washington, had their winter quarters at Morristown and vicinity on two different occasions. The first time was in January, 1777, immediately after the battles of Trenton and Princeton. The second was during the winter of 1779–80.”

But we pass to another touching illustration of those deep and tender sympathies which he cherished towards the objects of his love. It was when death threw its dark shadow over the loving and happy household. In 1844, the youngest child, Philip, a little more than nine years old, was taken sick, and died. The following passage, indicating how deeply all the chords of parental affection had been touched, has seemed to us, on many accounts, to be one of the most characteristic, and, at the same time, one of the most beautiful, which we have seen from his pen. It reveals the whole heart of its author as one of exceeding tenderness. After describing the funeral services, from the text—“Is it well with the child? And she answered, It is well”—he says:—

“He was carefully deposited in the narrow house, between twelve and one o'clock. The grave was deep—lined with hard brick at bottom and sides—the coffin carefully deposited, with planks of cedar around it as an outer box—then all arched over with brick by the mason—so that no earth fell harshly upon the coffin-lid. It was a sweet-looking house—secure from the approach of envy or ambition—a calm resting-place—a bed of repose—never more to be disturbed or alarmed until the morning of the resurrection, when radiant in beauty he shall be raised ‘a spiritual body.’

“He was the ‘loved one’ of the family. Oh! how we loved him! And oh! how he loved us! Docile, obedient, meek, gentle, mild, modest, unobtrusive, ingenuous, trustful, affectionate, dutiful, without guile or envy, ever ready to share his little treasures with his companions, or to bestow them on the needy. Beautiful and lovely—with a lofty forehead—bright, dark, speaking eye—chestnut hair—most expressive countenance—always joyous, but never boisterous. Sensitive, ethereal, intelligent—unsophisticated by evil communications—the con-

stant associate and friend of his parents, brothers and sisters, he knew nothing of the selfish, artificial, deceptive or corrupting manners and influences to which most children are, sooner or later, exposed. He was perhaps kindly taken from the evil to come: and removed to a better school and a safer home!

“His moral and intellectual developments appeared extraordinary—almost angelic—at least to the partial eye of doting affection—and seemed to promise much for the future. Precious, noble, generous boy! We shall ne’er behold his like again. Oh, why given? And oh, why taken away? He was our little Benjamin, the pet, perhaps the idol, of the family. He was younger, by *ten years and two months*, than any of our other children. He was singularly courteous and manly in his bearing, and in all his intercourse with society. He never failed to attract the special notice and admiration even of strangers, whenever seen by them. He was beloved by all the poor children of the neighbourhood. He was kind, obliging and grateful to everybody. Among the last of his *spoken* thoughts was the suggestion to his mother of plans of helping certain of his little friends whom he named. He seemed, during the whole period of his sickness, to think more of others than of himself. He expressed a wish to see God! Ah! whither has he gone? Where is he now? Shall we ever behold him again? Shall we go to him? Months have passed away, (February, 1845,) but the bright vision is ever present—the sweet countenance of our loving boy is always before the eye of our hearts—we dream of him—sigh and weep in secret—glance at the numerous tokens of his taste and ingenious industry all over the house and grounds, in silence—we utter no words of sorrow or complaint—the anguish of our spirit is not assuaged—the world around us wears the aspect of desolation and bereavement. A cherub in the skies is beckoning us upward and homeward to the peaceful mansions of the blessed—to the New Jerusalem, where God shall wipe away all tears from *our* eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away.”

In little more than a year after this affliction, (December, 1845,) he was called on to pass through another and still greater bereavement.

Margaret Elizabeth Lawrence, the wife of his youth, the mother of his children, for thirty-two years the companion of every joy and every sorrow of his heart, was removed from her earthly household to the "house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." It does not fall within our province here to speak of this eminently pious and gifted lady. Indeed, nothing more or better could be said, than to present in full, an obituary notice and tribute to her memory, prepared by himself at the time, and occupying thirty-two pages of his journal. We never met with a more strikingly beautiful and appropriate testimonial to the virtues of a wife and mother. We wish it were allowable to insert it entire in this memoir. But it was written, as he states, exclusively for the eye of his children, that "they might be able hereafter to comprehend more fully the worth of their incomparable mother;" and we do not feel justified in making any other use of it than that to which he had thus consecrated it. We may, however, without any breach of propriety, as illustrative both of her eminent Christian character, and his own feelings under such a loss, give a few paragraphs:—

"In her youthful days, in the City of New York and elsewhere, she had seen enough of fashionable life to be able to estimate, at its fair value, the whole circle of its vanities and enchantments. She studiously and resolutely avoided every approach to its insidious, unchristian dominion. She kept her children from its allurements. She neither read, nor permitted them to read, novels, romances, or any books calculated to dissipate the mind or to weaken the moral and religious principles which she daily inculcated, and uniformly exemplified in her conduct. Graceful, accomplished, fascinating in her manners, and in all respects qualified to *shine* in the gay world—she renounced it wholly on assuming the obligations of a wife, mother and Christian. Nay, before this, at the age of eighteen, in prospect of her connection with a minister of the gospel, she resolved never more to frequent any party, or scene, or place, or amusement which it would be improper for a clergyman to attend.

"Such was her good sense, such her clear perceptions of propriety, such her deep conviction of duty, such her fervent aspirations to be-

come in reality all that a consecrated Christian woman ought to be, that probably, henceforth, none of her most familiar acquaintance ever heard from her a word, or witnessed an action, that would be deemed inconsistent with the holiest devotion to the cross of her Redeemer. Thus consistent and devoted she ever lived. Truthful, confiding, just, sincere, honest, charitable, generous—humble, courteous, affectionate, magnanimous—without guile, envy, jealousy or covetousness—free from selfishness and all worldly ambition—strictly conscientious in every act and purpose of her life—a purer, more transparent, more sternly upright being I have never known. Artless, simple, unobtrusive, kindly, gentle, unpretending, respectful in her manner—she insensibly won the hearts of all who were sufficiently intimate with her to appreciate her character.

“But her troubles, pains, sorrows, are ended: and we are left to mourn *our* irreparable loss, though it be her unspeakable gain. My friend, companion, counsellor—the wisest, truest, safest, most judicious, affectionate, devoted, faithful—who had, for thirty-two years, shared my every thought, hope, fear, wish, sorrow, joy—has gone to her peaceful, happy home! And I am alone! Death had long been familiar to her thoughts. It was the theme of her daily and most solemn meditations. It seemed to me that she lived but to die. Christ was ever all her hope and all her trust.

“She loved to pray. She was habitually prayerful. She always joined most devoutly in the public prayers of the sanctuary. She prayed much in secret. No matter how numerous or oppressive her engagements and occupations, she found time every day for retirement and for closet devotions. This, too, in so quiet a way, that it might have escaped the notice and knowledge of ordinary observers, and even of her own family, had they been indifferent to the subject, or inattentive to her actions. Many an hour has she consecrated to prayer, during the silent watches of the night, while her household was hushed in sleep, and when no eye but the Lord’s beheld her. Oh, how she prayed for her children, for her husband, for all people—and for herself, as a poor, needy, helpless, perishing sinner! Yes; she ever regarded herself, as most of all, a debtor to the cross, and to

the grace of Christ, her merciful Saviour, in whom she humbly trusted, and through whose atoning sacrifice, we may confidently hope, she has at last entered upon the rest which remaineth to the people of God. 'Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints. Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God.' 'Never were modest worth, unaffected piety, and every domestic virtue, more strongly illustrated than in the character of this most amiable and excellent woman. Her sweetness of temper, simplicity of manners, and charitable disposition, are seldom paralleled, and never excelled.'

“Come, death, shake hands; I'll kiss thy bands:

'Tis happiness for me to die.

What! dost thou think, that I will shrink?

I'll go to immortality.'”

But this will be sufficient to show the depth and tenderness of affection which marked the character of Dr. Lindsley in all his domestic and social relations. As he approached the terminus of life, these occasions for sympathy were multiplied in the decease of several of his grandchildren, of whose births and deaths he always kept a careful record. The following letter will serve as a specimen of the style in which he was accustomed to address his children under such bereavements. It is addressed to N. Lawrence and Julia Lindsley, in their home, near Lebanon, Tennessee, on the sudden death of their little boy, Nathaniel Lawrence, at the age of five years and five months:—

NEW ALBANY, June 24, 1852.

MY DEAR CHILDREN:—We are grieved and distressed, beyond the power of language to express, on account of the sudden decease of your and our loved and lovely little boy. I can say nothing to alleviate the sorrow, or to mitigate the pain inflicted by this overwhelming dispensation of Divine Providence. I can only weep and pray with you and for you. “The Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord.” “What I do, thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter.” When we meet the smiling cherub—redeemed, sanctified, happy, blessed—in the Paradise above, we shall learn why he was thus early removed, and why our most precious

treasures are laid up in heaven—even against our fondest wishes. Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right? We must bow submissive to his will. May he grant us grace equal to our trials, and sufficient for our final triumph over every besetting sin or spiritual foe.

Your affectionate father,

P. LINDSLEY.

And here we may add another passing record from his journal, which, better perhaps than any formal and studied portraiture, illustrates his character and feelings in the relation of a master:—

“*September 17, 1846, Thursday.*—Our good and faithful servant, Hannah, died last night—or rather very early this morning. She has lived with us ever since our marriage. She was so much attached to her mistress, that she could not be persuaded to accept of freedom, and remain in New Jersey or New York. She and her mother and sister were inherited by my wife, (they and several others having belonged to her mother—all made free except Hannah, who refused.) Aged between fifty-seven and fifty-eight. The funeral services were performed by the Rev. Jeremiah Bowman, a negro Presbyterian minister. He preached a good sermon—sung several hymns—and prayed twice at the house and once at the grave.”

Thus, from a few touching memorials, penned certainly with no thought of their ever being used for such a purpose, we are enabled to discern the inmost spirit of the writer, and to mark that deep current of social and religious emotion which was ever flowing forth in all the relations of life. In these simple records we see the true index of character in the son, the husband, the father and the master, as ennobled, refined and sanctified by Divine grace.

XI. DECEASE AT NASHVILLE—TRIBUTES OF RESPECT.

The principal incidents of Dr. Lindsley's sudden death at Nashville, in 1855, while in attendance there as a member of the General Assembly of the Church, have already been given in another place. Up to Wednesday, twenty-third of May, he had been in his usual health, and during the preceding sessions of the body had freely participated in the debates—his last address having reference to the baptized chil-

dren of the Church. He was seized with illness that morning, while in conversation with his children at the breakfast table, and immediately passed into a state of unconsciousness, from which he did not recover. He lingered till one o'clock of Friday, twenty-fifth, when his spirit passed away.

It will not be out of place to give here some additional particulars, taken from the minutes of the Assembly, of their proceedings during his illness, and in reference to his death and funeral services.

After the reading of the minutes on Wednesday, Dr. Krebs announced to the Assembly that the Rev. Dr. Lindsley, who participated in the deliberations of the Assembly yesterday, lies this morning insensible, stricken with apoplexy: and moved that the Moderator be requested to lead the General Assembly in prayer for Dr. Lindsley and his afflicted family, under this painful and sad visitation. This motion was unanimously carried, and the Moderator complied with the request.

Dr. Lacy offered the following resolutions, which were unanimously adopted, viz.:—

1. *Resolved*, That the General Assembly have heard of the sudden illness of the Rev. Dr. Lindsley, a member of this body, with deep interest and sorrow.

2. *Resolved*, That the Moderator and Dr. Plummer be and they are hereby requested to visit Dr. Lindsley and his afflicted family at their earliest convenience, and assure them of the profound sympathy of the Assembly in this dispensation of Providence, and of their earnest prayer for his recovery, and for their spiritual support and consolation.

On Friday afternoon, the Moderator announced that Dr. Lindsley had died at one o'clock; whereupon, it was

Resolved, That the body of the deceased be brought to the church on to-morrow at eight o'clock, and that the General Assembly attend the funeral in a body.

At the request of the family, this arrangement was changed, and the funeral postponed till Monday morning.

When the Assembly met on Saturday morning, Dr. Jacobus, from

the Committee of Arrangements for the funeral, reported the following minute, which was adopted, viz.:—

WHEREAS it has pleased the Great Head of the Church to remove from his seat in this Assembly our revered father and beloved copresbyter, the Rev. Philip Lindsley, D.D.:

This Assembly would record, with deep emotion, the dealing of Divine Providence toward this body, and pray that it may be blessed to our admonition and spiritual edification. “The Fathers, where are they? and the Prophets, do they live forever?”

Our honoured and endeared father died in the midst of his children, in the circle of his early friends and fellow-citizens, and in the arms of his beloved church. He was called, as he could have wished, in the midst of active labour; found at his post; and faithful to the last. From serving this General Assembly, he was transferred, as we trust, to his blessed seat in the General Assembly and Church of the first-born which are written in heaven. The suddenness made it, to him, only the more of a translation. He walked with God, and he was not—for God took him.

Full of years and full of labours—the accomplished scholar—the successful educator—the eminent professor—the able ruler—the sound divine—the beloved disciple—it was allowed him, according to the willingness which he expressed only a few moments before the fatal stroke, to die here and now, in this city of his early friendships, among his children and brethren in the Lord.

We were privileged to take sweet counsel here with him. His fraternal and faithful words, up to the last, in this body, leave his memory fresh and fragrant, as is fit. It is the pleasure of this Assembly to attend his mortal remains to the tomb in confidence of his happy transition, and of his glorious resurrection. Like the great Patriarch, “after he had served his generation by the will of God, he fell asleep.”

Resolved, That this Assembly do tender to the bereaved widow and family of the deceased their Christian sympathies and earnest prayers; and that the Stated Clerk be directed to furnish them with a copy of this action.

The Assembly then adjourned, to meet on Monday next, at ten o'clock A.M., for business, the two previous hours of that morning being devoted to the solemnities arranged for the funeral.

Accordingly, after the solemn services of the Sabbath, the Assembly met at eight o'clock on Monday, twenty-eighth, to attend the funeral. The following members acted as pall-bearers: Walter Lowrie, Dr. Patterson, Dr. Boardman, Dr. Thornwell, Dr. Krebs, Dr. Lacy, Dr. Wines, Dr. Dumont, Luke Loomis, Judge Blake, Judge Fine and Dr. Plummer.

The exercises of the deeply impressive occasion were as follows:—

1. Invocation and Singing—"How blest the righteous when he dies," by Rev. Dr. Edgar, Pastor of the First Church, Nashville.

2. Reading of Ninetieth Psalm, by Rev. F. N. Ewing, of Bloomington, Illinois, a former pupil.

3. Sketch of the Life and Character of the deceased, by Rev. J. M. Stevenson, D.D., Pastor of the family at New Albany.

4. Address by Rev. Dr. Van Rensselaer, Secretary of the Board of Education, followed by Dr. N. L. Rice, the Moderator.

5. Prayer and Singing, by Dr. Lapsley, Pastor of Second Church, Nashville.

6. Benediction by the Moderator.

The body was then conveyed to the tomb, and deposited by the side of its kindred dust, in the Nashville Cemetery.

It may form an appropriate close to the present memoir to add a few of the many testimonials and tributes of respect, elicited by his death. We have no sympathy with those who speak disparagingly of the eulogium of the dead. There is no act of man more becoming than when the living respect and revere the memory of the dead—the virtuous, pious, gifted dead. It is a part of that influence which follows them, and by which they still speak. It is an incentive to virtue—a noble stimulus to exertion—held out to all the young, when they see that the great and good are not forgotten, but held in honour by those who survive them. It is the homage which nature pays to its benefactors when it can give them no other reward.

The following is the action of the Board of Trustees and Alumni of the University.

TRIBUTE OF RESPECT TO THE MEMORY OF DR. LINDSLEY.

Pursuant to notice, the Trustees and Alumni of the Nashville University met at the Law Office of Russell Houston, Esq., to adopt measures indicative of their profound respect, for the life and eminent services, and deep regret, at the melancholy intelligence of the death of the late Dr. Philip Lindsley.

Dr. Felix Robertson, the present Chairman of the Board of Trustees, was called to the chair, and Michael Vaughn, Esq., appointed Secretary.

Dr. C. K. Winston moved that Andrew Ewing, Capt. R. C. Foster 3d, and John M. Lea, be appointed a committee to present resolutions expressive of the sense of the meeting, concerning the object for which it was convened, which motion was adopted.

The Committee presented the following Preamble and Resolutions, which were unanimously adopted.

The Rev. Dr. Philip Lindsley, formerly a citizen of Nashville, and for many years the President of the Nashville University, departed this life on Friday, twenty-fifth instant, at the residence of his son-in-law in this city. To do justice in any measure to the life and character of the eminent deceased, whether considered as a learned theologian, a man of letters, or a worthy citizen, would require more time than is now at the disposal of the Committee. Dr. Lindsley was a native of New Jersey, and a graduate of Princeton College. Early after his graduation he was elected a Professor in that ancient and celebrated institution, soon promoted to the Vice-Presidency, and before the lapse of many years, so thorough a scholar had he become by availing himself of the opportunities afforded by his position, that the distinguished honour of the presidency was offered to him.

About the same time, the Trustees of the Nashville University, then Cumberland College, solicited him to remove to the West, and take charge of that institution. Contrary to the wishes of numerous friends in his native State, who were surprised that so ripe a scholar should

decline the eminent position of the presidency in one of the most celebrated institutions in the United States, he preferred coming to the West, and entered upon the discharge of his duties as President of the Nashville University, in the year 1825. From that time till his voluntary resignation in 1850, he laboured faithfully, diligently and successfully to advance the cause of education in Tennessee. The fruits of his twenty-six years tuition are properly appreciated and gratefully acknowledged. His various essays and discourses on education, his conversation, his lectures at the University, all aided much in bringing about the opinion which is universal, that the interests of education should be fostered and encouraged by the State. It was in the lecture-room surrounded by his class, that Dr. Lindsley made impressions, which through the class operated on public opinion. Those who have had the good fortune to listen to his lectures will not soon forget the words of wisdom which flowed from his lips, nor the pleasant, courteous and dignified manner in which he conveyed instruction.

It may not, perhaps, be going too far to say that, as a classical scholar, Dr. Lindsley had no superior in the United States, and upon all subjects appertaining to science and letters, his knowledge was not only full, but accurate. The respect entertained for Dr. Lindsley was not attributable, however, solely to his intellectual acquirements, extensive as they were; he was emphatically a good man and a Christian. At the time of his death, occurring in this city, the scene of his former usefulness and labours, during his attendance on the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, he was a Professor in the Theological Seminary at New Albany.* His efforts in the cause of education have therefore only ended with the limits of his life. A member of the Presbyterian Church, and an ornament to the ministry, he was catholic in his feelings, and liberal towards all denominations of Christians, and it was a matter of peculiar gratification to the Trustees of the Nashville University, that during his long services as President, that institution, founded by no particular denomination,

* He had resigned that position, as we have seen, the year before.

was entirely free from all sectarian influence, and equally liberal towards the various denominations for the gratuitous education of the allowed number of young men for the ministry. The Committee, in the few brief moments allotted them, can say no more of the great services and acquirements of the distinguished individual, whose death we mourn; nor in this community, where he was so well known, need his name and fame an eulogy. The growing sentiment in Tennessee in favour of education, is his monument. The Committee submit the following resolutions:

Resolved, That in the death of the late Dr. Lindsley, while the country at large has reason to deplore the loss of a great and good man, whose lifetime efforts were devoted to the advancement of knowledge and religion, the Trustees and Alumni of the Nashville University most deeply deplore the loss of him, the prime and vigor of whose life were spent earnestly and devotedly in their service.

Resolved, That we sympathize with the afflicted family in their distress at this melancholy dispensation of Providence.

Resolved, That we attend the funeral of the deceased, and wear the usual badge of mourning for thirty days.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That these proceedings be published.

FELIX ROBERTSON Pres't.

M. VAUGHN, Sec'y.

The following tribute is from the *Republican Banner* of May 31, 1855, written, we presume, by the Editor, Allen A. Hall, Esq., who had been conversant with his history and work at Nashville from the beginning.

REV. PHILIP LINDSLEY.

Notwithstanding the tribute from another quarter to the memory of this truly great man, which has already appeared in our columns, it is neither inappropriate nor too late to add this further record from our personal recollections of him. It will be conceded, that one has fallen among us, who has long been identified with the highest interests of this community, and who had done perhaps as much as the most

active to promote them. When, by the force of circumstances, he was removed from us several years ago, we believe that absence produced no estrangement, and that his heart was still yearning for the scene of his earlier and more vigorous labours. If duty called him elsewhere, and this could no longer be the theatre of his life, his fading eye was turning ever hitherward, as to the chosen place of its last slumber. And now, like an honest husbandman, he has ceased from his labour, and his sheaves lie about him.

Dr. Lindsley had little to do on earth which he had not accomplished, and he went down to death full of testimonials and ripened with the experience of this world. A student in his earliest boyhood, he never relaxed his devotion to the cause of Letters, but the fire of this enthusiasm seemed to become more intense, as the flame of life grew feebler toward its end. The influence of his scholarship has been deeply impressed upon the learning of the entire country. No man ever more completely mastered whatever branch of science he undertook, and there were but few subjects, which escaped the attention of his comprehensive genius. He possessed an intellect quick to acquire, and a memory tenacious of its acquisitions. Singularly enough, however, he was as remarkable for the accuracy of his scholarship, as for the variety and comprehensiveness of his learning. As a classical scholar, we probably risk nothing in the assertion, that he had no superior in America. He dealt with the facts and the philosophy of history as with household words, while he had made Theology and Government the subject of special study. In fact, we are acquainted with few branches of knowledge, among which may be included some of the natural and practical sciences, to which he had not devoted himself with the zeal of an enthusiast.

Dr. Lindsley wielded a pen of power, and it was well for the world that he had a chastened judgment and a benevolent heart to control its inspiration. His youthful ambition and desire to do good instinctively attracted him to the great Southwest, when it was yet comparatively a wilderness. His prophetic eye foresaw here a theatre at once large enough and susceptible enough for the activity of the most enlarged benevolence and lofty ambition. He threw himself nobly into

the van of the great army of civilization, in its southward march, and he has not failed to impress himself upon the great region which he adopted. His pen has been as a tongue of flame, in its advocacy of the cause and elevation of popular education. Public sentiment has long been thoroughly permeated by many of his liberal ideas, and the public may long since have forgotten the source from which those ideas were borrowed: but it was enough for the genius of such a man to achieve good, let the glory rest where it might.

We cherish the hope, that the world will yet be enriched by the production of many posthumous volumes from the pen of this truly great man.

Dr. Lindsley was President of the University of Nashville during a period of twenty-five years. The Alumni of that venerable institution, at least, will understand with what spirit of enthusiasm and self-sacrifice he devoted himself to its success. He was often tempted by the most brilliant inducements to separate himself from its fluctuating prospects and existence. For this office he declined the presidency of not a few of the first institutions in the Union. But he had early dedicated his talents to the building up of a genuine literature in the great Southwest, and he was not easily to be swerved from this leading purpose of his life. The fruits of his labours in this office are to be seen in the long list of gifted and eminent Alumni, who are ever willing to attribute much of their success to his early counsel and discipline. Dr. Lindsley possessed, to an extent beyond most men, that happy and peculiar faculty of inspiring the youthful mind with a generous and pure ambition, which labours for the good of the race, at the same time that it thirsts for personal advancement.

In the social circle he was much loved where he was at all understood. A student by profession, his habits did not suit the active habits of the world, and men were liable to mistake the retiring manner of the cloister for the frigid selfishness of the exclusive. Dr. Lindsley was warm and fascinating in the circle of his friends, and no man carried more genuine sunshine with him, wherever he was truly known.

But we have already too greatly protracted this hasty notice. The

deceased needs no tribute from us; his fame rests with a grateful community, and it is his highest praise to say, that his best and surest monument is to be found in the memory of all who rightly knew him.

Dr. Van Rensselaer, in his most impressive address before the Assembly, in the funeral services, made the following remarks:—

“He accepted the presidency of the University of Nashville in 1824, and for a quarter of a century devoted his life to the institution. In the midst of many difficulties and disadvantages, he persevered: and the presidency of an institution, which was so much indebted to the labours of the father, has descended, as the free gift of the people, to a son; and may the father’s work and the son’s work be carried forward, in providence, until this goodly city and this goodly State shall reap the blessings of a Christian University, on whose towers the name of Lindsley shall be immortal!

“It is proper to remark here, that Dr. Lindsley served God in whatever he undertook. His piety was deep, cheerful, unaffected. Whether he lived, he lived unto the Lord; and whether he died, he died unto the Lord; so that, whether living or dying, he was the Lord’s. In social life he pre-eminently shone. His heart was affectionate and easily won. His conversational powers were exuberant. There was a fund of anecdote, of information, of personal reminiscence, from which he drew with a prodigality that never exhausted it. His manners were bland and courteous. After my first interview with him, in this city, nine years ago, I thought, and still think, that I never saw a more charming specimen of a Christian gentleman, minister and scholar. His labours are over. His benignant face will never here kindle again with a smile, nor will his voice ever again be heard in our Assembly. His last address was in reference to the baptized children of the church. God had no more work for him to do. ‘Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord.’”

It would be easy, both from his private correspondence and the newspapers of the day, to multiply testimonials of his ability and success during the whole period of his presidency. He lived in a com-

paratively new country, where some of course could not fully comprehend what he was, or what he was attempting to do for them. But he did not live unknown, nor die unappreciated, either at home or abroad. We subjoin a few notices indicative of this appreciation. The following is from a Louisville (Kentucky) paper of 1840, written, if we mistake not, by an eminent medical professor there:—

“Dr. Lindsley has presided over the University of Nashville for nearly fifteen years, and has obtained for it not only a new but a great name. He is one of the most gifted and learned of all our writers and teachers. You say at once, on meeting him, that he is one of nature’s great men—inevitably great—but improved by study and art. He has a brow to grasp all sciences, and the field over which he has travelled is a very extended one. He is a deep, original, independent thinker, and comes down upon his subject like a strong man wielding a flail. But with all this vigour he has taste. His mind has all the polish which long familiarity with the great masters of ancient eloquence and poetry could give, and his style is as chaste as it is terse and energetic.”

In his correspondence of 1833, we find a letter from Hon. James K. Paulding, thanking him for a pamphlet just published, entitled “The Cause of the Farmers and the University of Tennessee,” consisting of two annual addresses delivered before the University. In the letter he says: “It is long since I have read anything more eloquent in language, or more conclusive in argument; and nothing surprised and delighted me more than the novel manner in which you have illustrated an old subject.” Accompanying the letter is a most genial critique on the pamphlet, which the writer had published in one of the Eastern papers, from which we take a few sentences:—

“The Discourses of President Lindsley should be read by every man in the United States. We do not mean by scholars alone, but most especially and emphatically by the respectable farmers and mechanics of this country, who are too apt to suppose that taxes and donations for colleges and universities constitute a burden without a benefit; at least any benefit of which they are likely to partake. He traces the stream of intellectual fertility in all its beautiful meander-

ings, and shows, that it is not alone those who reside at its source who partake in the riches it diffuses all around, but that its blessings pervade the whole land, and offer themselves spontaneously to all who choose to come and taste 'the waters of life.'

"Indeed, throughout the whole of these Discourses is diffused a glow of earnest eloquence, a generous spirit of chivalry in defence of science and learning, and a power of enforcing his sentiments, most highly honourable to the zeal and talents of President Lindsley. We scarcely ever recollect seeing a more powerful vindication of science and learning, or more conclusive arguments in favour of their universal diffusion."

One more notice shall suffice. It is from a recent number of the *North American Review*:—

"Of the intellectual fathers of the generation now on the stage, Dr. Philip Lindsley was one of the most eminent, useful and indefatigable in life, and his name will be held in deserved honour in coming years. In 1812 he became Senior Tutor, and in 1813 Professor of Languages, in the College of New Jersey. His learning and abilities as an instructor had now become widely known; and from his thirty-first year, until the impossibility of inducing him to change his sphere had been thoroughly ascertained, he was in receipt of frequent invitations to honourable appointments, to an extent perhaps unparalleled in the collegiate history of our country."

After enumerating these appointments, the writer says:—

"When the aggregate of learned judgment, represented by the action of so many boards of trustees, is for a moment appreciated, we shall be justified in saying, that the abilities and personal characteristics of no man who ever lived among us have received a more weighty indorsement. All literary men, especially all educators, therefore, will feel a lively interest in an attentive examination of the suggestions of such a mind."

THE PRIMITIVE STATE OF MANKIND.

[COLLEGE OF NEW JERSEY, 1820-1821.]

THE PRIMITIVE STATE OF MANKIND.

AN ATTEMPT TO PROVE THAT THE ORIGINAL OR MOST ANCIENT CONDITION OF THE
HUMAN FAMILY WAS CIVILIZED AND NOT SAVAGE.*

FEW subjects have given rise to more crude and unphilosophical speculation than the *primeval state* of mankind. That state is universally represented to have been, either comparatively rude and barbarous, or absolutely wild and savage. Almost the whole of our reading, whether of history, poetry or philosophy, has a tendency to create and to confirm this prejudice. So that we generally take the fact for granted without any investigation; and are fully persuaded of it before we condescend to canvass the logic by which it is so elaborately supported by its numerous advocates. That the Greek and Roman sophists should have entertained such a notion, or that the ignorant and self-sufficient free-thinker of modern times should be no wiser, is not greatly to be wondered at. But that any enlightened Christian,—much more, that a Christian philosopher or theologian should be found labouring in behalf of the

* These articles contain the sum or outline of the argument fully enforced and illustrated in a course of lectures on the Arts, Science and Literature of Antiquity; delivered to a volunteer class in the College of New Jersey, during the winter session of 1820–1821.

same doctrine, is truly matter of astonishment and humiliation.

The pride of system frequently leads very ingenious men into extravagancies on this, as upon other subjects. It is difficult, indeed, to avoid extremes when we enlist our feelings, as well as our reason, in favour of any theory. But here we are peculiarly liable to err. Nature herself, in all her operations, utters a language and exhibits facts calculated to mislead us. All animals, with which we are acquainted, commence their existence in a comparatively weak and helpless condition. Everything in the vegetable kingdom is subject to a similar law. The stateliest oak in the forest has been an embryo in the acorn. The lion and the elephant might once have been crushed beneath the feeblest hand. Every man *now* living has been an infant; and whether the inmate of a palace or a cottage, he was once a debtor to the anxious and constant care of others for the preservation of his life, and to their instruction for the elements of whatever knowledge he possesses. The rule is universal. It has no exceptions. It is certain even, that no mortal would ever speak, or contrive a language, were he to receive no assistance from others; or were he to be totally excluded from social intercourse, so as never to have it in his power to *imitate* articulate sounds.

Thus, then, from analogy, we are led to contemplate the primitive state of man as similar to that of infancy. We are prone to regard the beginnings of all things as small, and feeble, and rude. We always suppose *time* to be necessary to impart vigour, and beauty, and magni-

tude, and maturity. States and empires have grown up to power and splendour through years of discipline, and effort, and struggle. Individuals make great literary and scientific attainments in the same manner. And can it be presumed that what is *now* true of every man, and of every association of men, was not true of him in his original or first condition?

Admitting that all men are descended from a common ancestry, why should we suppose that the first families were wiser and more ingenious, more improved and cultivated, than millions of their posterity are, at this moment, known to be? Have not men been found in a *savage* state in every age of the world, to which authentic history extends? How could men lose a knowledge of the arts—especially of the useful arts—and degenerate into savages, if their forefathers had ever been civilized and enlightened?

These and many similar inquiries may, we think, be satisfactorily answered, without at all countenancing the hypothesis upon which they have been grounded.

The savage state was not the *primeval* state of man. If it had been, man would have remained a savage to this day. There is no proof that any nation, or society, or tribe, or family, or individual has ever advanced to a state of civilization without the aid and instruction of those who were previously civilized. There is abundant proof to the contrary.

We propose to establish and to illustrate the following proposition, namely:—

Man has ever been a civilized being. Such was he

created, and such do we find him in every age.* The stream of civilization can be traced back from one period and country and nation to another, till we arrive at the original fountain in that paradise of beauty and innocence in which man first awoke to the praises of his Maker and to the healthful exercise of all his faculties.

REASON, REVELATION and HISTORY confirm this view of the subject.

I. REASON.—Does not reason tell us that man must have been created, at some period or other, by an almighty, independent, all-wise and beneficent Deity? If so—and every other hypothesis would land us in atheism and absurdity—does not reason intimate that a Creator, infinitely wise, good and powerful, would, at the first, have endowed man with all the faculties, moral, intellectual and corporeal, in such a state of maturity, and with such an aptitude to every exercise and pursuit and attainment, as his distinguished rank among the creatures of God, and his high destiny seemed to require?

Was man designed to be the representative of Deity in this lower world—the lord of creation—the absolute sovereign over all the other animals—the undisputed master of all the riches upon the earth: and can it be that he should have been ushered into the midst of all this vast and varied inheritance, without one qualifica-

* Not everywhere, indeed; but somewhere—in some part of the world. So that there never has been a period of time, however brief, when civilized man could nowhere be found upon the earth.

tion for its proper management or enjoyment?—in fact, unconscious of what he was, or of what he was destined to become?—without language, and ignorant that he possessed the capacity of inventing or acquiring any?—without arts, and with fewer instincts than other animals?—in a word, a mere brute, and of the meanest, most miserable, and most helpless order? Would not a constant miracle have been necessary for the protection and sustenance of such a creature? Does *reason* then furnish any plausible support to such a theory? Does she not at once pronounce it incredible—impossible?

We are aware that we have presented, what may be thought, an extreme case;—that we have supposed a state of savageness, or rather of brutality, much worse than is generally contended for. It may be worse than what would suit the notions of some; but not so bad but that we may readily find for it many ingenious and confident advocates.

Diodorus Siculus, in the beginning of his history, says that men at first lived dispersed like the beasts, in caves and woods, and subsisted upon the natural productions of the earth; that they had no use of speech, and uttered only inarticulate cries; but that having herded together from fear of the wild beasts, they invented a language, and imposed names upon things. (*Diod.*, lib. i. cap. 8.)

The Epicureans, it is well known, held the same doctrine. Lucretius, a distinguished poet and philosopher of this famous school, in his fifth book, *De Rerum Natura*, describes the primitive state of our race very minutely and accurately, according to the system of his sect.

After telling us how men lived in the woods and mountains, without the use of fire, he adds:—

“Nec commune bonum poterant spectare, nec ullis
Moribus inter se scibant, nec legibus uti.
Quod cuique obtulerat prædæ fortuna, ferebat,
Sponte sua, sibi quisque valere et vivere doctus.”

After which, he proceeds to relate how men associated together, which he ascribes chiefly to the fear of wild beasts, and how they built huts, discovered the use of fire, and reared families. Even this, however, would not have sufficed to the ultimate preservation of the race:—

“At varios linguæ sonitus Natura subegit
Mittere, et Utilitas expressit nomina rerum.”

So that, according to Lucretius, language was invented by men, after they had associated together, and made some progress towards civilization.

This system appears to have been very popular at Rome, during the brightest period of her literature and philosophy. Horace, one of the best of her poets, and reputed a philosopher of no ordinary character, and belonging to the same school with Lucretius, has these remarkable lines:—

“Cum prorepserunt primis animalia terris,
Mutum et turpe pecus, glandem atque cubilia propter,
Unguibus et pugnīs, dein fustibus, atque ita porro
Pugnabant armis, quæ post fabricaverat usus;
Donec verba, quibus voces sensusque notarent,
Nominaque invenère: dehinc absistere bello,
Oppida cœperunt munire, et ponere leges,
Ne quis fur esset, neu latro, neu quis adulter.”

Sat. 3, lib. i.

And Cicero (*De Inventione Rhetorica*, lib. i. c. 2) asserts the same doctrine: “Nam fuit quoddam tempus, cum in agris homines passim bestiarum modo vagabantur, et sibi victu ferino vitam propagabant; nec ratione animi quidquam, sed pleraque viribus corporis administrabant. Nondum divinæ religionis, non humani officii ratio colebatur: nemo nuptias viderat legitimas: non certos quisquam inspexerat liberos: non jus æquabile quid utilitatis haberet, acceperat.” Again, (*De Legibus*, lib. 2, cap. 14,) speaking of the Eleusinian mysteries, he says: “Nam mihi cùm multa eximia divinaque videntur Athenæ tuæ peperisse, atque in vita hominum attulisse, tum nihil melius illis mysteriis, quibus ex agresti immanique vita exculti ad humanitatem, et mitigati sumus.”

Thus, also, Juvenal:—

* * * * “Mundi
 Principio indulsit communis conditor illis
 Tantum animas, nobis animum quoque; mutuus ut nos
 Affectus petere auxilium, et præstare juberet,
 Dispersos trahere in populum, migrare vetusto
 De nemore, et proavis habitatas relinquere sylvas
 Ædificare domos, laribus conjungere nostris
 Tectum aliud, tutos vicino limine somnos
 Ut collata daret fiducia; protegere armis
 Lapsum, aut ingenti nutantem vulnere civem:
 Communi dare signa tubâ defendier isdem
 Turribus, atque una portarum clave teneri.”

Sat. 15, v. 147, etc.

Nor is his account of the golden age much more flattering. (See *Satire* 6, at the beginning, etc.)

“Credo pudicitiam Saturno rege moratam
 In terris, visamque diu; cùm frigida parvas
 Præberet spelunca domos, ignemque, Laremque,
 Et pecus, et dominos communi clauderet umbrâ:

Sylvestrem montana torum cùm sterneret uxor
 Frondibus et culmo, vicinarumque ferarum
 Pellibus: haud similis tibi, Cynthia, nec tibi, cujus
 Turbavit nitidos extinctus passer ocellos:
 Sed potanda ferens infantibus ubera magnis,
 Et sæpè horridior glandem ructante marito.”

It is unnecessary to quote many authorities on this subject. The truth is, that a similar train of sentiment seems to pervade the philosophy and the mythology of the classic ages. We meet with it in the theology of the early Christian fathers. And among modern writers, whether Christian or infidel, it would be difficult to enumerate all who have professedly or incidentally advocated or countenanced the same system. “The greater part of modern philosophers (says one of them) have declared for the original *savageism* of men.”*

* As specimens of the several classes of authors who have, in their various works, insinuated or assumed or distinctly enunciated the same doctrine, the following names may be cited, viz., Hobbes, Rousseau, Hume, Condorcet, Buffon, Kaimes, White, Robertson, Gillies, Shaftesbury, Russell, Voltaire, Raynal, Millot, Astle, Darwin, Condillac, Adam Smith, Gibbon, Maupertuis, Michaelis, Volney, Tytler, Priestley, Mallet, Heeren, Klaproth, Ferguson. See, more especially, Goguet’s “*Origin of Laws, Arts and Sciences, and their Progress among the most Ancient Nations;*” Gebelin’s “*Monde Primitif, analysé et comparé avec Le Monde Moderne;*” and that most ingenious of all philosophical romances, the “*History of the European Languages,*” by the late Alexander Murray, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, etc. in the University of Edinburgh. The whole current of our periodical literature is in a similar vein. Thus, in the first volume of the *Classical Journal*, (page 41,) the late Professor R. Scott, of Aberdeen, treating “*Of the Origin and Progress of Language and Writing,*” commences a paragraph as follows: “As language must at first have been the invention of rude and unenlightened men, very little raised above the state of barbarism, it may appear to some of my readers very difficult to

Passing, therefore, a multitude of names, we proceed to pay our respects to its most distinguished champion among the philosophers of the last century. In that very learned, elaborate, and, in many respects, ingenious treatise, on “The Origin and Progress of Language,” by the late celebrated James Burnett, afterwards Lord Monboddo, of Scotland, we have a complete development of the old Epicurean theory, in all its most repulsive features. The learned author intended no caricature, but a beautiful and finished picture. He was an enthusiast in the cause; but yet cool, collected, and persevering in his investigations of all the stores of ancient and modern learning, and of all the facts with which he could become acquainted. It is true, that, like most other honest, candid, unprejudiced inquirers after truth, he set out upon his researches, or voyage of discovery, with his mind made up—with his system already formed;—and, of course, he readily enough met with materials adapted to his purpose, quite sufficient to eke out a very plausible case; and, in his own view at least, to operate perfect conviction upon all the *ethereal* spirits capable of comprehending him. But, let the philosopher speak for himself: “I cannot doubt (says he) but that I shall convince every one who will think it worth his while to read what follows, that articulation is altogether the work of art, at least of a habit acquired by custom and exercise, and that we are truly by nature the *mutum pecus*, the mute

comprehend how such men should have been capable of exercising that degree of abstraction, which the formation of its mere elements implies.”

herd, that Horace makes us to be. This, I think, I am able to prove, both from *theory* and facts." (Vol. i. p. 185.)

We shall not accompany him through his curious details of facts, derived from ancient historians and from modern voyagers and travellers; the *fish-eaters*, the *wood-eaters*, the *insensibles* of Diodorus Siculus; the *Troglodytes* of Herodotus; the *Bornians* of Leo Africanus; and the thousands of brutish hordes of savages and cannibals, reported to have existed or as still existing in America, in Africa, in New Holland, and in the islands of the great Pacific Ocean: all of which the author carefully marshals and arrays in support of his theory. He avails himself too, with great skill, of the opinions of eminent writers, ancient and modern, whenever they seemed to favour his own. We say *seemed*; for he sometimes appears to have decided rather hastily, or he could never have dragged Plato and Warburton into his ranks;—men who, though they did not entertain, what we deem, orthodox sentiments on this subject, yet differed widely from his Lordship in the main features of his scheme.

After thus citing a host of facts and authorities, to prove that men are allied to the *Simian* tribes—that man and the monkey belong to the same species—and are no otherwise to be distinguished from each other than by circumstances, which can be accounted for by the different physical and moral agencies to which they have been exposed, he very modestly adds: "This opinion, therefore, of mine may be false; but it is not new

nor singular; and being supported by such respectable authorities, I may say the concurring testimony of all ancient authors who have treated the subject, is, I think, entitled to a fair and candid examination, which, however, it cannot expect from vulgar prejudice, but only from men of liberal thought, and more than common learning; and it is for such only that I write." The author did not here mean to intimate that he himself entertained a shadow of doubt on the subject. On the contrary, he fully believed everything that he has advanced. "The orang-outangs (says he) are proved to be of our species by marks of humanity that I think are incontestable." (*Ibid.*, p. 375.)

Now although his Lordship has exposed himself to much ridicule for having thus gratuitously provided his ancestors with *tails*, and has thereby brought his system somewhat into disrepute, yet we cannot help thinking that he has pursued quite as logical and philosophical a course as others have done; who, commencing with the same general premises, have yet stopped short of the same pleasant results. He has accomplished in this department of science what Berkley and Hume effected in metaphysics. He has reasoned consistently upon false, but hitherto almost undisputed principles. He has arrived, by a legitimate process of induction and argumentation from unquestioned data, at conclusions, which shock as extravagant, or provoke laughter or pity as ridiculous or absurd. The true dignity of man, and his original character and condition, will probably be better understood and appreciated, in consequence of his

learned labours to degrade him. His book may possibly open the eyes of many, who will startle at what appears monstrous, while otherwise they might not choose to suspect the soundness of commonly received dogmas.

We could as soon go all lengths with Monboddo, as subscribe to the following statement or position of Adam Ferguson, in his *Essay on Civil Society*: “The individual in every age, has the same race to run from infancy to manhood, and every infant or ignorant person now, is a model of what man was in his original state.” He evidently intends to avoid the extravagance of the former, and of the *ultra* Epicureans, for he adds, a few pages after: “If there was a time in which he had his acquaintance with his own species to make, and his faculties to acquire, it is a time of which we have no record, and in relation to which our opinions can serve no purpose, and are supported by no evidence.” This is put hypothetically. It may, or it may not have been so. We know little or nothing about the matter, according to this sagacious political philosopher and able historian.

Again, in the progress of his work, he presents us with another view of the subject, a little modified, indeed, but in the main sufficiently consistent with the one already cited. “The inhabitants of Britain, at the time of the first Roman invasions, resembled, in many things, the present natives of North America; they were ignorant of agriculture, they painted their bodies, and used for clothing the skins of beasts. Such, therefore, appears to have been the commencement of history with all nations,

and in such circumstances are we to look for the original character of mankind.”*

Dr. Beattie, speaking of the system of Epicurus, which had found so powerful an advocate in his erudite but eccentric countryman and contemporary, has the following very just observations:—“One would wonder, (says he,) what *charms* men could find in a system so degrading to our nature; or what *evidence* in that which has no other foundation than poetical fancy and wild hypothesis. The Pagans, indeed, who knew little of the origin of mankind, might be excused for favouring an opinion, which, as it appears in Lucretius, has at least harmonious numbers and elegant descriptions to recommend it. And yet, unseduced by poetical allurements, Quintilian declares, in the language of true philosophy, that moral sentiments are natural to us, and that men had speech from the beginning, and received that choice gift from their Creator. And Ovid’s beautiful account of the first men seems to have been composed, partly from Hesiod’s Golden Age, and partly from traditions founded on the Mosaic history of the creation;—that we were at first good and happy, and lost our felicity when we lost our innocence.—Is it not an idea more honourable to our nature, more friendly to virtue, and more consonant to the general notions of mankind, than that we were in the beginning a species of wild beast, and afterwards by *improvement* degenerated into wicked and wretched men? If there be, in the con-

* Ferguson’s Essay on Civil Society, p. 125. See also Robertson’s History of America, vol. ii. pp. 34–51, where a similar opinion is maintained. Also Millot’s Ancient History, at beginning.

sciousness of honourable descent, anything that elevates the soul, surely those writings cannot be on the side of virtue which represent our nature, and our origin, as such as we should have reason to be ashamed of. But he who tells me, upon the authority of Scripture, and agreeably to the dictates of right reason, that we were all descended from beings, who were created in the image of God, wise, innocent and happy; that, by their and our unworthy conduct, human nature is miserably degraded; but that on the performance of certain most reasonable conditions, we may retrieve our primitive dignity, and rise even to higher happiness than that of our first parents;—the man, I say, who teaches this doctrine, sets before me the most animating motives to virtue, humility and hope, to piety and benevolence, to gratitude and adoration.” (*Beattie’s Theory of Language*, p. 100.)

Again, he says: “We learn to speak, when our organs are most flexible, and our powers of imitation most active; that is, when we are infants. Yet even then, this is no easy acquisition, but the effect of daily exercise continued for several years from morning to night. Were we never to attempt speech till we are grown up, there is reason to think that we should find it exceedingly difficult, if not impracticable.”

Mute savages have been found in deserts and forests who never could be taught to speak. In every language there are certain peculiar accents and articulate sounds which they only can pronounce with ease or accuracy, who have learned to do so when very young. “If, then, there ever was a time, when all mankind were *mutum et turpe*

pecus, a dumb and brutal race of animals, all mankind must, in the ordinary course of things, have continued dumb to this day.—For, to such animals speech could not be necessary; as they are supposed to have existed for ages without it; and it is not to be imagined, that dumb and beastly savages would ever think of contriving unnecessary arts, whereof they had no example in the world around them.” Further, according to Dr. Johnson: “Speech, if invented at all, must have been invented, either by children, who were incapable of invention, or by men, who were incapable of speech.” “And therefore reason, as well as history, intimates that mankind in all ages must have been speaking animals; the young having constantly acquired this art by imitating those who were elder. And we may warrantably suppose, that our first parents must have received it by immediate inspiration.” (*Beattie.*)

Indeed, no other account of the origin of language is rational or philosophical, or even plausible,—to say nothing of Scripture. When it is said that our first parents must have received the art of speech by immediate inspiration, it is not necessary to suppose that the Creator inspired them with any particular original or primitive language; but that he made them fully sensible of the power with which they were endued of forming articulate sounds, gave them an impulse to exert it, and left the arbitrary imposition of words to their own choice. But however this might be, we find Adam in fact, as soon as created, giving names to all animals, and holding converse with his Maker, and with his Maker’s

“last best gift,” which alone constituted his beautiful Eden a perfect Paradise. We find him from the beginning a social, domestic, speaking and religious being. Man is called by Homer *μῆροψ*, or *articulate speaking*; and certainly there is no other characteristic at once more noble and more peculiarly his own.

That man, then, in his primeval state, had no affinity with any species of the brute creation—that he never was a quadruped, using his hands for feet—that he never possessed any of the ornamental or superfluous appendages peculiar to the wild beast of the forest—and that he never could have been destitute of speech or language—the physiologist, the anatomist, the historian, the philologist, the Christian divine, with several even of the ancient sages and poets, unite in attesting. “Of standing facts there ought to be no controversy,” says Dr. Johnson. “If there are men with tails, catch an *homo caudatus*.” The Epicurean theory, therefore, must be surrendered as utterly indefensible upon any rational ground.

Thus far, then, authority, as well as reason and facts, will sustain our doctrine; or be found arrayed against the scheme so beautifully portrayed by Lucretius, and so speciously elaborated by Monboddo.

But the proposition, which it was our main design to demonstrate, is vastly more comprehensive. It is not enough to prove that men were not originally a *dumb* and *brutish herd*. Our object was to show that men were not originally even savages; that they were not a wild, rude and barbarous race, like the ancient Gauls

and Britons, or like the present Indians of America or Negroes of Africa.*

We have already suggested the presumption which REASON, *a priori*, furnishes against this still almost universally prevalent theory. The *reductio ad absurdum* will apply to the latter with scarcely less propriety and effect, than to the revolting extravagancies of the Epicurean school.

The argument from SCRIPTURE and HISTORY remains yet to be exhibited.

II. SCRIPTURE.—Let us then appeal to the oldest written record in the world. Read the Mosaic account of man's creation. Behold the first pair in the garden of Eden; and appointed "to dress it, and to keep it"—with "dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth."

* Dr. Blair, in his Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles-Lettres, which are studied, as orthodox, wherever the English language prevails, takes for granted, throughout, that the *savage* was the primitive state of man. This is more especially apparent whenever he has occasion to trace to its origin any human art, science, invention, discovery, custom or opinion which comes within the scope of his extensive and diversified speculations. See, in particular, his Lectures on the Rise and Progress of Language. In Lecture 38, on the nature of Poetry, he remarks: "In order to explore the rise of poetry, we must have recourse to the deserts and the wilds; we must go back to the age of hunters and of shepherds; to the highest antiquity; and to the simplest form of manners among mankind." And that we may not be left in any doubt about his opinion of the most ancient condition of our race, he presently adds: "It is chiefly in America, that we have had the opportunity of being made acquainted with men in their savage state,"—*i.e.* with men in their original or natural state.

Recollect that everything was created in a state of perfection or maturity. All animals and vegetables were of full size and vigour. They required no time to grow. Ripe fruits were upon the trees; and every living creature was prepared at once to enter upon its destined career. Thus, too, was man created—vigorous and mature in all his faculties of body and mind; ready for every work and duty which his situation demanded; with God for his companion, friend and instructor. Horticulture was his first employment. This has never been the occupation of savage life. Hunting, then, or the chase could not have been the primitive mode of procuring a subsistence. Or, in other words, the *hunting state* is not the state of nature, or of man in his original, natural condition. And yet savages, in every age and country, have been and still are *hunters*. So that *hunting* may be assumed as a universal predicate or characteristic of savage life. Adam therefore was not a savage.

He must have been an eminent naturalist, at least zoologist, if he gave appropriate and significant names to all animals. Of his first two sons, the one was a farmer, and the other a shepherd.

Cain, the first born of the human race, built a city, and called it Enoch after his own eldest son; and, of course, must have known all the arts which such an undertaking implies or requires. And that *cities* might have been very necessary, or at least very convenient, will appear sufficiently obvious, when we consider the amount of population which probably existed even at this early period. According to several profound bib-

lical antiquaries and expositors, there might have been many hundreds of thousands. We do not vouch for the accuracy of any of the speculative calculations which have appeared upon the subject of the antediluvian population. We may be sure, however, that none of the *Malthusian* obstacles to the rapid increase of the human species could have been pleaded by old bachelors *then* as *now*, by way of apology for disobeying one of the first, most positive, and most reasonable commands of their Creator.

Lamech, the fifth in descent from Cain, was the father of Jabal, Jubal and Tubal-cain, who are represented by Moses as having been extraordinary proficient in several of the arts, both useful and ornamental. (About A.M. 500.) Jabal “was the father of such as dwell in tents, and of such as have cattle.” Or, he was a famous shepherd and tent-maker; and a teacher of others. Abel had been a shepherd long before. Jubal “was the father of all such as handle the harp and organ,”—or all *stringed* and all *wind* instruments; the original terms being generic. Tubal-cain was “an instructor of every artificer in brass and iron;” the first *smith* on record;—a noted manufacturer of warlike instruments and domestic utensils;—an ingenious artist, and a teacher of others. Agricultural implements, at least, must have been in use several centuries before. For Cain was “a tiller of the ground,” and Adam a gardener. The former, too, had built a city; and of course, it may be presumed, made use of *iron* in sundry ways. Savages know nothing of iron.

Here, it might not be irrelevant to the general scope of our argument, to glance at several of the circumstances which were peculiarly favourable to the progress of the arts among the antediluvians.

1. Their great age; and probably greater size and strength. Most of that very small number of individuals whose age is recorded by Moses, lived nearly a thousand years; and others may have lived much longer, for aught we know to the contrary. What might have been achieved in science and the arts, by genius and perseverance, during a single life protracted through a period of eight or ten centuries, can only be conjectured from the efforts of modern intellect, since life has been limited to threescore years and ten. "There were giants in the earth in those days," (Gen. vi. 4,) that is, before the deluge—as there were soon after.

2. They had stronger inducements to the erection of superior, more costly, more durable and more capacious edifices and monuments, public and private, than exist at present. They might reasonably calculate on reaping the benefits of their labours and expenditures.

3. The immense population of the antediluvian world. Sundry very learned and judicious authors suppose that, upon a moderate computation, there were in this world at least two millions of millions of souls. Arts *must* flourish in the midst of such a population. Even the necessaries of mere animal existence could not be procured by such a multitude, in a savage or uncivilized state.

4. One language before the deluge. This peculiar dis-

tinction of the antediluvians, probably contributed more than any or all others, to their steady advancement in knowledge and the arts; and certainly to prevent their degeneracy into savages.*

5. The earth was probably more fertile, and the climate more healthful, and more auspicious to longevity, and consequently to every species of mental and corporeal exertion and enterprise, than at present. We refer to the cosmogonists and archæologists generally, for an account of the physical changes which the earth is supposed to have undergone in consequence of the deluge; as regards its internal structure—the order,

* The most direct, efficient and obvious cause of the speedy degeneracy of a large proportion of our race immediately after the general dispersion, was, no doubt, the “confusion of tongues” which preceded and occasioned that event. This sudden and extraordinary multiplication of languages among the primitive inhabitants of the plains of Shinar, I believe, is not usually assigned as a cause of the *savageism* which ensued. At least, I have not met with it. It deserves a more prominent exhibition and development than it has hitherto obtained. I once supposed it so easy a matter to account for the existing diversity in language, that I scarcely deemed a miracle necessary at the outset to effect it. My opinion on this subject is totally changed. Without a miracle, human language would have continued *essentially* one, after the flood, as it had been before; and then the savage state would never have existed—at least in the ordinary course of human events. Language in itself, and while uninfluenced by other or foreign dialects, is the most immutable and permanent thing in the world.

Again: should it be assumed that the art of writing, in some form, is indispensable to civilization, and that neither the Antediluvians nor early Postdiluvians possessed the art, and therefore that they must have been barbarians or savages, I answer: It cannot be *proved* that writing was *unknown* at any period anterior to the age of Moses; in whose time, even alphabetical writing, as we now practise it, was as perfect as it has ever been since.

arrangement and mixture of its several strata—the formation of mountains, valleys, oceans, islands, lakes, deserts, marshes—its fertility and salubrity—the position of its axis, whether at first inclined to the plane of the ecliptic as at present; or whether the plane of the equator was coincident with the plane of the ecliptic, so that the sun in its diurnal motion would *seem* to move always in the equator, but henceforth became oblique to the same;—whence an increase of the year from 360 days to its present length; whence also the difference of seasons, and the effects of such a change, etc.

But, to proceed with the argument. Moses is our only authority for everything appertaining to the antediluvian world. He has rapidly sketched the mere outlines of its history. A few most important facts he has clearly stated. These facts accord with the dictates of enlightened reason and sound philosophy. He has solved the problem of this world's origin; and supplied the elements from which the true character and condition of our wayward race may be ascertained from the beginning. He gives “a local habitation” to the golden age of fiction; and shows us how “death and all our wo” were the consequence and the penalty of man's disobedience to his Maker's righteous mandate.

In dignity, in intellect, in virtue, in happiness, in glory, he was, at the first, but a *little* lower than the angels. What he would have been, had he remained innocent and dutiful, is not for us to conjecture,—except so far as we know what angels and the spirits of the just made perfect are and ever will be. But though great

was his fall from this exalted height, yet he did not sink so low in the moral or intellectual scale, as at once to lose his knowledge or his faculties. Though guilty, condemned, degraded, he was still sustained and cherished and guided by the kindly arm of infinite mercy and wisdom. Though the earth was cursed for his sake, yet he still retained his dominion over it. And although in the course of a few generations, we behold the countless millions of our race rioting in all manner of wickedness, with the exception of a single individual and his family, still we discover no traces or vestiges of savage life upon the earth. Men may lose all knowledge of the true God, all reverence for his character and laws, all relish for his service and worship, while yet they may be highly distinguished in science and the arts. Ancient Egypt, and Greece, and Rome will testify, that the grossest moral darkness and depravity do not always imply, or are not necessarily connected with, a corresponding degradation of the intellectual character,—or that they are at all inconsistent with the highest state of civilization and refinement.

During the first historical period then of 1656 years (Hebrew chronology)—that is, from the creation to the deluge—all mankind, or at least the generations from which Noah descended, were civilized.

Of the state of the arts in Noah's time, we may form some conjecture from the ark which he constructed (by the divine command indeed, but without any extraordinary aid or direction, so far as we know) for the purpose of preserving himself and family, with as many of the

different species of beasts, birds and reptiles, as were necessary to replenish the *new* world with inhabitants, after the destruction of the *old*. This was probably the most astonishing structure, on several accounts, that ever rested upon the earth, or floated upon the surface of the mighty deep. A ship of at least one hundred thousand tons burthen! What a specimen of architectural skill, was not this last memento of antediluvian art? Noah was its builder—its architect;—he directed and superintended the work. Thousands of artisans, mechanics and labourers were, no doubt, employed on it, who perished beneath the waves which bore it from their reach and from their view forever.

When Noah entered the ark, he was 600 years old. Japheth, 100—Shem, 98—and Ham, probably 96. They therefore had time and opportunity sufficient to become intimately acquainted with all the arts and learning which the antediluvians possessed. And we may reasonably conclude that they diligently and successfully improved the time and the means which they enjoyed. They knew that they were to be the depositaries of all the knowledge and attainments of past ages; and to become the instructors of future generations. They were familiar with the cities, edifices, and other productions of the art, genius and industry of the old world. The ark itself was many years in building before their eyes. They lived together a year within its capacious bosom—where they had the finest opportunity possible for the study of zoology; and, next to Adam, they were prob-

ably better versed in that department of natural science than any other mortals have ever been.

How much of the abstract sciences, and how much of literature they may have derived from their ancestors and brethren, it is impossible for us to determine. If we say they had nothing, be it so. It is, however, after all, a mere *gratis dictum*. The fact can never be proved. Astronomy is conceded by many, from a variety of circumstances, to have been considerably known before the deluge. But it is the fashion to deny everything to antiquity, in favour of which we have no direct positive evidence. Conjecture or analogy is not allowed to supply the absence or defect of explicit testimony or substantial proof in any case.

It would be too mortifying to the pride of modern science to suppose it, for a single moment, to have been within the range of possibility, that the ancients should have made the sublime discoveries and demonstrations of a Newton or La Place. Granted that they did not. We shall probably, however, in the course of our investigations, find some things to balance the account. Facts are stubborn things. Fortunately for the fair fame of ancient genius, there are living witnesses yet speaking, and speaking loudly, in the midst of surrounding desolation and barbarism, the praises of an age to which even Grecian history does not reach.

But let us return to the mountains of Armenia, and see the little remnant of the human family issuing from the ark, and commencing a new career in a world in which probably not a vestige remained to awaken melan-

choly recollections or tender associations—not a relic of that grandeur and magnificence on which they had formerly gazed with admiration, or contemplated with sentiments of unutterable compassion in the view of that awful catastrophe which they foresaw would speedily overwhelm their vain and guilty possessors.

How long the ark itself continued as a monument of art, or a memorial of divine vengeance and of divine mercy—or as a model of great design and exquisite skill in architecture, whether for ship-building and naval enterprise, or for temples, towers, public or private edifices—Moses has not told us, and tradition is not worth regarding.

Noah, we are informed, became a husbandman. He began the world (to use a common phrase) as Adam and his sons had done before him, by cultivating the earth. Here then is no approach to savage life.

Noah and his family, for some time probably, cultivated the valleys in the neighbourhood of Ararat, one of the mountains of Armenia, on which the ark settled after the subsidence of the waters. As they increased in numbers, they appear to have passed along the banks of the Euphrates, which rises in the mountains of Armenia, (vid. *Herodotus*,) till at length they came to the plains of Shinar or Babylonia,—allowed to be the most fertile country in the East. Here they built a city and commenced a tower, whose top might “reach unto heaven,” *i.e.* to the visible heavenly luminaries or to the clouds. For this purpose they burnt brick, which they used instead of stone; “and slime,” or bitumen (*Lat.*

Vulg.) or ἀσφαλτὸς, (*Græc. Sept.*) “had they for mortar.” (Gen. xi. 3, 4.) Three years, it is said, they prepared their materials, and twenty-two years carried on their building. Their arrogant and rebellious attempt displeased the Lord, who miraculously confounded their language, which put an effectual stop to the work, procured for it the name of Babel or “confusion,” and obliged the people to disperse themselves, and replenish the world.

It is thought by some that the family of Shem did not concur in this presumptuous enterprise,—that Nimrod, the son of Cush and grandson of Ham, was the principal leader: but of this we have no certain evidence. What became of this mighty tower (commenced about 100 years after the deluge) we cannot determine. Nearly 1800 years after its erection, Herodotus saw a structure at Babylon (the temple of Jupiter Belus) consisting of eight towers, raised one above another, built of bricks and bitumen, of immense size. This lofty edifice is believed by many to have been the identical tower described by Moses. Bel or Belus was a title given to Nimrod, according to Bryant. Its ruins, or the supposed ruins of this ancient tower or temple, have been frequently noticed by antiquaries and modern travellers.*

* Vide Herodotus, St. Jerome, Calmet, Bochart, Rollin, Bryant, Rich, Niebuhr, Rennell, Della Valle, Ker Porter, Grotfend, etc.

It is very questionable, however, whether even the site of old Babylon can be ascertained at the present day. Lucian intimates that not a vestige of Nineveh remained in his time; and he *predicts* that such also would soon be the fate of Babylon. In this particular, at least, he accords with the Hebrew prophets.

It is not material to our present purpose to inquire into the object or end for which this remarkable tower was built. Some suppose it was designed to be a “temple to the host of heaven,” or for idolatrous worship of some kind;—others, that it was intended to afford an asylum to the builders and their families in case of another deluge; like the Pyramids of Egypt, perhaps;—others again, that it was designed to be the central ornament or principal fortress of a grand metropolitan city, the seat of government, in order to prevent a general dispersion of the people. “Let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.” (Gen. xi. 4.)

The sons of Noah had witnessed the massive and colossal structures of the old world—they had seen the great ship which had preserved them from a watery grave—ambition or vanity, or a distrust of the divine providence and promise, might have prompted them, at least some of them, (say the family of Ham, known to have been profane and disobedient,) to imitate the proud monuments of art which had adorned the antediluvian world, that future generations might possess a specimen and a model of the same stupendous and magnificent architecture—or that their own name might be immortalized by their labours—or that it might serve as a citadel or military castle of defence and protection—or as a palace or residence for their chief, (Ham, for instance, or Nimrod,) for many centuries to come; not realizing that their life was to be shortened—or—but it is no matter what they had in view.

It proves that they were still equal to great undertakings; that they had not lost that knowledge of the arts which they must have brought with them from the ruins and the wreck of former nations. They were still a civilized people.

Down to this period assuredly, if there be truth in Scripture, no trace of savageness can be found in our world. We fearlessly and most confidently oppose facts to theory. And we are willing cheerfully to submit the case to any honest, enlightened, independent jury of our peers.

Civilization and the arts continued to flourish in the countries first occupied after the flood. In the fruitful plains of Shinar or Babylon—upon the eastern and southern shores of the Mediterranean—along the banks of the Euphrates, the Tigris and the Nile—and in the adjacent regions.

But here commences a new era. Mankind were now to be dispersed and scattered over the face of the earth.

As men travelled further from their original residence—into colder, more sterile, more inhospitable, or more unhealthful climes—into rocky, mountainous regions—remote islands, impervious forests and deserts, by this time filled with beasts of prey and venomous reptiles—especially when the colonies were small and indifferently furnished with artisans and mechanics, or with the implements and utensils indispensable to agriculture and carpentry—in such circumstances, it is easy to account for the speedy degeneracy of numerous tribes, and for their lapse into a barbarous and savage state.

Thus, Northern Asia, the greater part of Africa, the islands of the Mediterranean Sea and of the ocean, Europe and America, appear to have been inhabited by rude and savage and migratory hordes, as far back as history and tradition extend; while the same history and tradition—together with Scripture—assure us that Chaldea, Assyria, Phœnicia and Egypt,—perhaps India and other Eastern countries,—were civilized and polished from the remotest times, or from the beginning. And these have proved the fountain of civilization, letters and the arts, to every part of the globe, where they have been found, or where they now exist.

From the building of Babel to the period at which Egypt appears, on the page of authentic history, a great and flourishing empire, famed alike for wealth and power and wisdom and science, the interval is short; the steps are few and easily marked.

We have thus presented the outlines of our general views on this curious subject, under the heads of REASON and SCRIPTURE.

The *third* branch of the argument, namely, that from HISTORY, will be illustrated in a future article; in which, we shall endeavour to ascend the historical stream of civilization, till we fairly land upon the classic shores of ancient Greece; whence, confessedly, modern Europe and European America have derived all their civility, literature and arts. Nor shall we assign the palm of originating these to the ingenious Greeks; much as we admire them, and unquestionable as are their claims to the everlasting gratitude of mankind. We shall pursue

our voyage to Egypt and the East;—where will be found all the luxury, beauty, opulence, splendour and refinement which usually distinguish the meridian of national greatness, or which characterize its decline—even at the earliest epoch to which Grecian history and tradition ever ventured to approach. Here was civilization of the highest order, when the Greeks themselves were, by their own showing, fierce and untamed barbarians.

Thus, commencing from the creation of man, we learn from Scripture that he existed in a civilized state, at least down to the period of the general dispersion: and, reversing the order of our inquiry, we shall find from *history* that civilization is still traceable up to the age and the region *when* and *where* this memorable event is believed to have occurred.

THE PRIMITIVE STATE OF MANKIND.

[CONCLUDED.]

I HAVE said that it can be proved from REASON, SCRIPTURE and HISTORY, that the primitive state of the human race was *civilized*. I have shown how reason, prior to any investigation of facts, confirms the position, and how unreasonable is every other hypothesis. I have exhibited the scriptural account of man's creation; and exposed the absurdity of supposing that he could have proceeded from the hand of an infinitely wise, good and powerful Being, mature in his corporeal faculties, and yet destitute of mental furniture, or deficient in wisdom and intellect. Or, in other words, that he should have been formed only a *full-grown infant*; and, in that helpless condition, have been left by his Creator to grope his way in this new world, friendless, ignorant, unprotected—without a guide or instructor to aid in the gradual development of his rational powers, and in the attainment of that knowledge and skill which his situation imperiously demanded from the beginning; and without which he must either soon have perished, or remained forever in a degraded and brutish condition. I have shown that Scripture, so far from countenancing any such representation of his original state and character, does directly and

most clearly contradict it. I have rapidly sketched his early history, and brought under review the several facts recorded by the pen of inspiration calculated to illustrate this dark period of human society,—extending from the creation to the deluge. I have followed the same safe and infallible guide, from the *second* commencement of our wayward race, to the building of the tower of Babel: and in all this progress through the lapse and the revolutions of nearly eighteen centuries, we have discovered no trace of *savage* life upon the earth.

All the *data* with which we are furnished, and all the analogical reasoning which these data suggest, go to the establishment of the proposition, that man existed from the beginning in a state of civilization, with very many, if not all, of the arts and improvements which usually distinguish and adorn such a state; and that he continued in this state down to the period just specified. I have also shown it to be highly probable that, soon after the dispersion of mankind from the fruitful plains of Shinar, they began in many places to degenerate; that, while the arts flourished and extended along the banks of the Tigris, the Euphrates and the Nile—upon the eastern and southern shores of the Mediterranean Sea—in the intermediate and adjacent countries—and perhaps far into India and the East—they were either totally or nearly lost by the numerous colonies which migrated, under inauspicious circumstances, into more barren, ungenial and inhospitable climes, especially where all future intercourse between the colonies and the parent stock was rendered difficult or impracticable. I have shown

how easy it is for men to degenerate into savages;—that this is a very natural process and of frequent occurrence; that we everywhere behold families and individuals, even in the midst of the most refined society, and within sight of our proudest institutions of science and noblest monuments of art, ignorant, degraded and removed but a single step from the savage of the wilderness; that it requires the constant care and studious discipline of parents and teachers for many years, to train up children to habits of industry, good order and common civility of deportment,—to make them respectable farmers, mechanics and tradesmen; much more to imbue their minds with science and literature to qualify them for distinction and eminence in the liberal arts and professions, and for all the various walks and departments of honourable life and elegant pursuit, which are supposed to be worthy of the ambition of the most exalted genius.

Let children grow up without any portion of this culture, and they will be but little the better or wiser for having been born in a land of light and knowledge. In this respect, the son of a philosopher is on a level with the son of a beggar; and, *a priori*, it is just as likely that the child of a Cherokee warrior should become, under the same or similar advantages of education, an ornament to the republic of letters, as it is that the child of the President of the United States should be thus distinguished. *Cæteris paribus*, it is education alone that constitutes the difference between one individual and another. And this same tedious, painful process of tuition and training must be repeated with every genera-

tion. Wherever it is relaxed or intermitted, there will appear a corresponding declension or degeneracy. Knowledge cannot be inherited, like property. And none of us will ever be the wiser for the attainments of our ancestors, though we could number in the proud catalogue all the Bacons and Aristotles that have ever lived, unless we pursue a similar laborious course of study and self-cultivation in order to reach the same eminence. All this is sufficiently obvious; though seldom taken into the account by those who speculate on the subject of human improvement.

There is no golden or royal road to science; and yet, somehow or other, we are constantly deluding ourselves with the fancy, that, as the world grows older, it must become wiser. That every new generation commences where the former left off, and has nothing to do but to add to the stock already acquired. In one sense, this is true. It is certainly easier to travel in a beaten path than to discover or strike out a new one. It is easier to master a well-digested system of science than to contrive or invent a different or a better. And when an ardent, gifted, talented, enterprising individual shall have mastered what is known, he may possibly advance into the unknown, and contribute something to the general or common fund of human knowledge. But then he must first go through the drudgery of an apprenticeship. He must labour hard, and labour long, in order to become initiated in the profound mysteries which have exercised the wit and occupied the lives of those who have gone before him. How few, after all, have ever comprehended

the science of a Newton—much less improved or enlarged it! How few, among the thousands of erudite and accomplished scholars of modern times, can be named with Sir William Jones in the field of universal literature! And upon whom has fallen the mantle of the recently departed Davy, and Cuvier, and La Place, and Bowditch?

Now this train of remark will apply to every degree of excellence, in every department of knowledge, and to every art and vocation of common life. It shows at once the difficulty of keeping the world up to the mark (if I may so express it) which it has actually reached, and the facility with which it may recede or decline from it. And were it not for the art of printing, (but recently invented,) which perpetuates and widely diffuses every novel discovery and improvement; and which has rendered the vast stores of ancient literature and science easily accessible to all; our own age might have witnessed as barbarous a neglect of the philosophers of the last, as those of Babylon and Egypt and Greece were successively doomed to experience.

I have said that it is impossible for men in a savage state ever to advance, by their own unassisted efforts, to civilization and refinement. The history of every savage tribe, from the most remote ages in which savage life has been known to the present moment, bears testimony to the fact. It is now more than three hundred years since Columbus discovered our own continent:—but the American savages are, at this day, as distant from civilization as they were when the white man first began to encroach upon their forests, and to exhibit to their view the con

veniences and comforts of European art and industry. And, in any case, where they have been tamed, enlightened and civilized, it has been owing to the persevering discipline and culture of the benevolent Christian missionary and teacher, who have generously devoted years to this philanthropic object. In general, too, they have succeeded only with the children of the savage; and that by withdrawing them wholly from their native associates, and by educating them precisely as other children are educated. In all the regions of the Old World which are known ever to have been inhabited by barbarous and savage tribes, but which are now civilized and polished, it is easy to show from whence, in what way, and at what period, they severally received the arts and polish of civilized life; and that, in every instance, they were indebted to *others more improved than themselves* for all their acquisitions. From analogy, we may and must conclude that such will ever be the order of events.

The Mexicans and Peruvians of the New World furnish no exception to the rule. We know very little of their history. We cannot tell whence they derived the few rude arts, which, it is admitted, they possessed when first visited by the Spaniards. It cannot be proved that they had ever been destitute of those arts. The probability is, that these were the remnant which they inherited from their ancestors, who had migrated from the mother country (the original fountain of all the arts) under more favourable auspices, than did those of the neighbouring tribes in either North or South America; or, what is more probable, that the latter, in their wan-

derings, had degenerated and sunk lower in the descending scale than the former. But after all that has been urged in favour of the Mexicans and Peruvians, it can hardly be conceded, that a people, who had not the use of iron in any form among them—who, though possessing the richest mines of gold and silver, knew not how to work them or to extract the pure metal from the ore, and had no more of these precious commodities than what they chanced to find in a virgin state, and who were conquered by a handful of needy and desperate adventurers—could prefer any just claims to the character of *civilized*.

It has been said by Dr. Robertson and others, that the aborigines of this vast continent must have arrived from a country destitute of the useful and necessary arts, such as the knowledge of working iron, for instance; because these arts can never be lost. Now, in opposition to this whole theory, we have proved from Scripture, that iron was in common use long before the deluge; that Noah and his family must have known and did actually exercise many of the arts confessedly belonging to a civilized state; and that in the countries first settled after the flood, these arts have always flourished; and, consequently, that the fact of any people's existing, on the face of the globe, ignorant of these arts, clearly proves that, at some period, no matter how remote, they must have lost them. If Noah were really the father of the whole human race, and if any portion of his descendants can be found wholly destitute of those arts of primary necessity which he undoubtedly had, and which he im-

parted to his immediate posterity; then it follows, that these *necessary arts* may have been and must have been utterly lost by such portion of his descendants as are now found without them. It is no matter then whether the American Indians lost them before they reached these shores or long after their arrival hither. The position of the learned historian is untenable. And it cannot fairly enter into the question of the original peopling of this hemisphere.*

III. HISTORY. But how does history confirm our view of the primeval and early state of mankind? Does history accord either with the deductions of reason or the representations of Scripture, as I have exhibited them? Do not the Greek and Roman historians *seem* to convey a different account of the matter? Does not the voice

* Mr. Bancroft, in the third volume of his *History of the United States*, concludes that America was peopled from eastern Asia; that the Mongolian and Americo-Indian races are identical in origin; that the epoch of their divergence or separation was at a period so remote, that the peculiar habits, institutions and culture of the aborigines must be regarded as all their own, or as indigenous. "By this hypothesis (says a writer in the *North American Review*, No. 110) he extricates the question from the embarrassment caused by the ignorance which the aborigines have manifested in the use of iron, milk, etc. known to the Mongol hordes, but which he, of course, supposes were not known, at the time of the migration." When did the Mongols acquire or lose this knowledge? If Noah and his children possessed it, and if both the Mongols and Indians are his descendants, then it must have been *lost*—at least by some of them.

I incline to the opinion, that most of the American tribes are descended from Ham; and that they migrated to this continent, by way of Africa and the Atlantic Ocean, soon after the dispersion at Babel.

of antiquity proclaim that man was once rude, barbarous and savage. Here, I acknowledge, we are beset with some apparent difficulties in the outset. These, I think, could be easily dissipated, were it not for the prescriptive dominion which the classic authorities have obtained over our philosophy, as well as over our ordinary habits of reasoning and reflective associations. We have been misled both by their facts and their poetry.

Let it be recollected that the aborigines of Greece and Italy were a barbarous—perhaps savage people. (We shall hereafter see how they became civilized.) It was natural, as they advanced in the arts, for them to conclude that their own primitive condition was really the primitive or original condition of mankind. At any rate, their poets, while giving the reins to romantic fancy, and mingling fact with fiction, delighted in painting the scenes and in celebrating the exploits of savage life and savage daring; in tracing the progress of human improvement from the rudest beginnings; and by the witchery of harmonious numbers, imparting beauty and order and life and reality to imagination's wildest figments. They never dreamed of a more ancient or more cultivated model of social existence than their own limited domestic sphere of observation and experience supplied or suggested. These worthy votaries and favourites of Apollo and the Muses, though no conjurors, seem to have been well aware of their high vocation, and to have very liberally availed themselves of the *license* and the *inspiration* accorded to them, by common consent, as professors of

the "art divine." Hence, among other "miracula speciosa," by the magic spell of their poetic enchantments, they caused their ancestors to spring up, full grown and completely armed, from dragon's teeth or from their mother earth: and thus conferred upon the natives the distinctive and flattering epithet or title of *earth-born*; which was the more grateful to their national vanity, as it excluded or concealed all obligation to a foreign origin or to foreign wisdom.*

The agency of the gods was deemed necessary to restrain and mitigate the furious passions of these presumptuous and cruel sons of *Terra*; who, in some instances during "the heroic ages," seem to have outwitted and vanquished Jupiter himself. However, in process of time, by the kindly teachings of Bacchus, Mercury, Janus, Vulcan, Apollo, Ceres, Minerva, and the rest of their good-natured and obliging deities, male and female, these vagrant robbers and cut-throats were converted into honest agriculturists, gentle shepherds and clever artisans.

Thus the poets preoccupied the ground: and long before the sober historian began his chronicle of humble life, they had given universal currency and reputation

* The Athenians assumed to themselves the appellation *αὐτόχθονες*, as though they had been produced from the same earth which they inhabited: and as the ancients commonly denominated themselves *Γηγενεῖς*, sons of the earth, the Athenians took the name of *Τέττιγες*, grasshoppers. In allusion to this designation, many of them wore golden grasshoppers in their hair, as an ornament of distinction, and a badge of their antiquity; because those insects were thought to have sprung from the ground.

and sanctity to the theogony and mythology which they themselves invented, or fabricated from the popular superstitions and legends of their own country, or from such historical and biographical facts or mythical traditions as they had collected among the polished nations of the East. The machinery and fables and fancies of poetry soon passed for realities; and thus became associated and incorporated with whatever was held as true and sacred in science and religion. When the historian at length appeared, and commenced the record of his country's fame, it was natural for him to look back into ages that were past, and to search for the materials of a regular narrative from the earliest period to his own times. And here he was compelled to have recourse to the prevalent poetic faith of his countrymen, or else to do violence to their prejudices and vanity and superstition, by a bold rejection of their whole system. The latter was not to be expected. Nor did he venture upon the rash experiment. He adopted the vulgar notions which time and poetry had sanctioned and hallowed. He traced their own origin—and gratuitously referred the origin of other nations—up to a period, more or less indefinitely remote, when the arts and manners of civilized life were yet to be acquired. The same causes also led the philosophers, in their speculations, to erect systems upon a similar basis. With most of these, man was assumed to have been at first but a little in advance of the brute with which he associated in a common forest.*

* Modern philosophers have commonly started from the same point.

Thus all things conspired to render this doctrine plausible, and to give it a passport to universal acceptance. It became a part of the national creed of the Greeks; and, after them, of the Romans.

Still we, now and then, behold the feeble glimmerings of a few scattered rays from the sun of truth beaming through the darkening mists of poetic illusion and philosophical refinement. A golden age—a happier state—a brighter, purer, more enlightened period sometimes inspired the Muse's lay, and seemed to point to that Eden of innocence and bliss of which the Bible tells us, and of which some faint traditional remains had escaped the general wreck of historic truth. The gods too, say they, taught the people agriculture and the arts. Was not this merely disguising the fact that they owed all to foreigners? By their own admission, then, they received extraordinary aid and instruction from some quarter; and it matters not, so far as our argument is concerned, whether the divinity interposed to rescue them from ignorance and barbarism, or whether they derived the same favours from wiser mortals, or from those nations which they denominated barbarians. For thus the Greeks, be it remembered, flattered their own vanity, and manifested their contempt for all other nations, however polished or powerful, by this sweeping sentence of degradation, implied in the contemptuous appellation—*barbarians*. All their writers, whether poets, historians or philosophers, liberally employed it on every occasion. And thus also did the Romans, in regard to all other nations except the Greeks;—for to these, they

acknowledged themselves debtors exclusively for their own literature, arts, laws and civility. By this preposterous and arrogant procedure, they effectually kept out of view the claims of every other people to greater antiquity and to profounder science than their own. An odious epithet, applied to those whom we fear or hate, or affect to despise, has ever proved the most cogent species of logic which can be addressed to the populace. The Grecian sages, as we shall see, knew better.

But what, after all, do their historians say on this subject? Their conjectures ought to go for nothing: their statements, built on fable and fiction and national prejudice and vanity, must go for nothing. What they themselves saw and heard and examined, and what they learned from authentic sources, we will believe. Thus far their authority deserves our respectful consideration and claims our assent, but no further. Does Herodotus then, the father of profane history, tell us of barbarous nations, of savage tribes and hordes? Yes: and there were many such in his day, as there were in the days of Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, Cæsar, Livy and Tacitus; and as there have been ever since. But what says Herodotus respecting Assyria, Phœnicia and Egypt? He found them, indeed, rapidly losing that proud pre-eminence which had so long distinguished them among the nations of the earth. Still he everywhere beheld enough of magnificence and grandeur to overwhelm him with astonishment; and to render perfectly credible all that was told him of their ancient greatness. He surveyed, as it were, but the ruins of those mighty empires

which had flourished through a period of nearly two thousand years, unrivalled in arts and science and letters and power and splendour, and which had already diffused the light and comforts of civilization to many rude and distant nations

Did Herodotus ascertain that the Babylonians or Egyptians had ever been a wandering, fierce, brutish, hunting race, similar to the savage or half-savage tribes then existing in various parts of Asia, Europe and Africa? He did not. Nor is there a single fragment of *authentic* history in the world, which intimates that those celebrated nations had ever been destitute of the usual arts and intelligence of civilized life. I repeat, that the romance of poetry is not to enter into the account: nor is the metaphysic of philosophy to weigh against fact. In the days of Hesiod and Homer, those empires were in the zenith of their glory. That they had ever been otherwise than polished and enlightened and great and powerful, the Greeks did not know and could not prove. Their poets, philosophers and historians, who, at later periods, travelled far and resided long in the East, appear to have learned but little of their early history.

We have then no historical evidence that man was ever found in a savage state, or in a state at all approaching the savage, in the countries specified. All the evidence of history goes to establish the contrary opinion. As far back as we can trace the history of the Assyrians, Phœnicians and Egyptians, we find them civilized, and that too in a very high degree. Now, what right have we—supposing we could extend our

researches no further—to infer that they were ever otherwise than civilized? or that their ancestors had been savages? None at all: unless it could be proved that these were not the most ancient nations in the world; and that the nations from which they sprung had been originally savage. This, it is apprehended, none will attempt to prove. History then confirms the argument grounded on Scripture and Reason.

Should it be objected, that the proof from history is merely negative; that though it establish the fact of civilization in the countries already mentioned, up to the remotest period to which it reaches, yet that it leaves us in the dark in regard to their earliest condition and character: I answer, that it is clear, direct and positive, so far as it touches on the subject. And this is sufficient for our purpose. If history cannot point us to the time and the place *when* and *where* the most ancient inhabitants of the earth were savages, then history utterly fails to countenance the system of those who maintain that the *savage* was the *primeval* state of mankind. If history represent the most ancient people ever known in the world as civilized at the time when its records commence, then does history yield all the support to our system of which it is capable.

It is much to be lamented that all the ancient archives of Nineveh and Babylon and Tyre and Thebes and Memphis have perished. For, that they once possessed very ample histories and annals, we have abundant testimony. Their loss is but poorly supplied by the comparatively modern Greek and Jewish historians, or by the Christian

fathers. It is to the Bible chiefly, that we must have recourse for information relative to all that vast period which elapsed anterior to the time at which Herodotus commences his elaborate and interesting history.

Here it may be proper to remark, that after the more learned of the Greeks had ascertained their own origin, and had become convinced of their obligations to Egypt for letters, arts and philosophy, they then indulged in a strain of eulogy and admiration bordering on extravagance whenever they had occasion to speak of their intercourse with that marvellous country. Nor did they hesitate to assign to their recently discovered instructors and benefactors the most remote, as well as the most resplendent antiquity. "For my own part (says Herodotus) I am of opinion, that the Egyptians did not commence their origin with the Delta, but from the first existence of the human race." (*Euterpe*, 15.)

But, in the absence of every other source or means of information, let us follow the sure guidance of revelation. Or, if any further aid from revelation be refused us, inasmuch as our appeal has been made to history; let us recur to Moses and the prophets merely as historians, and allow them to be as trustworthy as other historians, neither more nor less. And *less* credible, they will not be deemed even by those who deny them the infallibility of plenary inspiration.

Moses informs us that, about one hundred years after the deluge, agreeably to the Hebrew chronology, the earth was divided among the descendants of Noah according

to their families, tongues and nations.* In this grand division—made, we presume, by Noah, pursuant to the divine command—Shem had the south of Asia; and the Jews, Arabs, Persians, Hindoos, with the inhabitants of farther India and the Asiatic Isles, are numbered among his descendants. Japheth obtained the northern and central parts of Asia, the Isles of the Gentiles or Europe; and, more recently, large portions of America. China, according to Sir William Jones, was originally peopled by a colony of Hindoos, with which their neighbours and conquerors, the Tartars, afterwards intermixed. Japan was very anciently peopled from China, and was subsequently subdued by the Tartars, etc. So that China and Japan are now inhabited by a mixed race descending from Shem and Japheth. To Ham was allotted Africa, together with certain districts of Asia. The mighty empires of Assyria and Egypt, the commercial republics of Sidon, Tyre and Carthage, the Philistines and other nations of Palestine or Canaan were his inheritance and his posterity. From him also are probably descended the American Indians.

In the tenth chapter of Genesis, we have a particular

* Whether this division took place before or after the building of Babel is disputed. Bryant says, "that there were two memorable occurrences in ancient history, which the learned have been apt to consider as merely one event. The first was a regular migration of mankind in general by divine appointment: the second was the dispersion of the Cuthites, and their adherents, who had acted in defiance of this ordination;" that the Cuthites, under their leader *Nimrod*, refused to emigrate, built Babel, were punished, and scattered abroad into different parts, etc. Hence the fables of the Titans and Giants, etc.

account of “the generations and the sons of Noah,” and of the beginnings of many cities and nations. Thus, about one hundred years after the deluge, *Nimrod*, the son of Cush and grandson of Ham, commenced his career in Shinar as a mighty warrior and conqueror. Among other cities of less note, he built or began to build Babylon, afterwards “the glory of kingdoms, and the beauty of the Chaldees’ excellency.” *Ashur*, son of Shem and grandson of Noah, built Nineveh, and gave name to the empire of Assyria. Or if, instead of the common version of Gen. x. 11, “out of that land went forth Ashur, and builded Nineveh,” we adopt the marginal reading, which is preferred by Bochart and other learned critics, the text will stand thus: “Out of that land he (Nimrod) went forth into Assyria and built Nineveh.” This is probably the true reading. It better accords with the context, and with the subsequent fortunes of that remarkable city, and of Ham’s posterity generally.* *Ninus*, its reputed founder, and from whom it was named according to Oriental tradition, may have been a son of Nimrod, or merely another name for Nimrod himself. But however all this may be, there is no doubt that Nineveh was built at this time, or about one hundred and thirty years after the flood; and that it soon became an exceedingly great, magnificent and renowned metropolis.

Mizraim, (*i.e.* the family of Mezz,) son of Ham, peopled Egypt. Throughout Africa and the East, Egypt is to this day called *Mezz*, and the Egyptians *Mezraim*. An-

* Bryant dissents from Bochart, and very ingeniously defends the common version.

other son of Ham, *Canaan*, peopled the land of Canaan, afterwards Palestine, or the promised land—the future home of the Israelites. *Sidon*, son of Canaan, gave name to the city Sidon, and was the father of the Sidonians. *Uz*, grandson of Shem, is supposed to have settled in Coelo-Syria, and to have been the founder of Damascus. This famous city, by whomsoever built, belongs undoubtedly to the earliest ages: and it has never ceased to act a conspicuous part at every epoch of Oriental history, from Abraham's time to the present day.

We thus behold the inhabitants of this new world, going forward with spirit and enterprise to build cities and to form civil communities, as soon as their numbers would permit. And the grandest cities which have ever existed, at least since the deluge, were founded soon after that event. Nay, they actually reached the highest pitch of power and splendour within a very few centuries, some of them, probably, long before the death of Noah. Profane history does not carry us back to the period at which Nineveh and Babylon and fifty other cities were *not* large and splendid. Nor can it tell us *when* or by *whom* they were built; or what were the several steps in their progress to greatness. The Bible informs us only *when* the foundations were laid. But the Bible ever after speaks of them as large and magnificent cities. That many of them were so within a very few years cannot be doubted. As soon as there were people enough in the world to build cities, it might be expected that they would build them. And that there might have been a population of hundreds of millions, has been

shown by the calculations of sundry eminently learned and judicious writers. Should any persons, however, be inclined to demur or to cavil on this score, they are welcome to all the benefit which the chronology of the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint version can afford them.* That cities should have been built during the lifetime of a single monarch or patriarch, or by a single generation, need not surprise us. Everybody knows the history of Alexandria in Egypt—and of the scores of cities built by the successors of the Macedonian conqueror. St. Petersburg too is a modern instance of a similar kind. And as to American cities—they grow up so rapidly and so abundantly, that no mortal pretends to an acquaintance with their statistics or hardly with their geographical positions.

But the further we ascend towards the commencement of human enterprise, the greater do we find the combination of skill and effort in the production of imposing and colossal works of art. Probably the labour bestowed on the tower of Babel—certainly that bestowed on many a structure in Egypt, say a pyramid, or labyrinth, or temple—would suffice to build a modern city of very respectable dimensions. The truth is, for several centuries after the flood, something of the antediluvian spirit and fashion seems to have prevailed among mankind. Everything was designed and executed on a grand scale, and in the most durable style. It is immaterial at present to inquire what could have induced men, in those early ages,

* See Dr. Hales's *New Analysis of Chronology*; and Dr. Russell's *Connection of Sacred and Profane History*.

to unite in the construction of such massive and costly edifices. Whether it was the result of voluntary action on the part of the labourers, or whether it was the effect of despotic power, is of no consequence to the main purpose of our investigation. Were we to admit that the whole was the work of slaves—that all the mighty monuments of Asiatic and African grandeur were the works of slaves—still, this would no more prove a general deficiency in science or the arts, than the existence of slavery in our own *free*, happy and *Christian* country, implies a want of knowledge, skill and enterprise in the nation at large. If the ancient despots of the East possessed slaves in sufficient numbers to convert mountains of granite into temples and statues, it would not follow, either that the *master spirits*, who planned and directed such gigantic labours, were destitute of talent and science, or that the slaves themselves were in a state of misery and degradation without a parallel in modern times, even in the most enlightened and most signally favoured monarchies and republics.

Conceding all that has been said and written about the wretchedness of the people employed in those extravagant enterprises of ancient vanity and ambition to be strictly true, it will not follow that those people, however wretched they may have been, were any more wretched than certain classes of *human creatures* in other countries—than the peasantry, the serfs, the vassals, the villains, of Christian Europe—to say nothing of the African *anomaly* in Christian America; or of the baser castes throughout India under the gentle protection of their

most gracious Christian benefactors. The moral and political condition of the great mass of the (so called) lower orders of the people, under the different European governments, is probably elevated but little above that of the subjects or the slaves of the former lords of Egypt and Assyria.

Multitudes of human beings may be found, all the world over, engaged in pursuits, or doomed to occupations, not a whit more rational or grateful or beneficial, than were the wildest, most extravagant or most onerous ever devised or imposed by the tyranny or superstition of antiquity. Were men, employed in the construction of a pyramid, for instance—with pay or without it, as slaves or as hired servants—likely to have been subjected to greater hardships and privations, or to a more arbitrary treatment, than are the soldiers in the ranks of a modern army? or than the sailors on board a man-of-war, or before the mast of a merchant ship? or than the operatives in an English cotton factory or upon an American cotton plantation?

We do injustice, therefore, to the ancient Orientals, when, from the assumed misery and servile condition of the lower classes, we infer a corresponding and universal degradation of the human mind; when we argue, that, because the many appear to have been ignorant and depressed, therefore the few, or the whole must have been equally destitute of intelligence, sagacity, wisdom, science and enterprise; that Abraham, Joseph, Moses and Job were not superior to the vulgar nomad of the desert, or to the murmuring cowardly Hebrew herdsman. We

must utterly eschew all our republican logic and prejudices of this sort, while we listen to the truthful voice of universal experience. The great masses of mankind have, at all times, been controlled and directed and fashioned by the wisdom or the cunning or the will of the few. And it is the character of the *few* which invariably fixes the historic character of every age and of every country. The light of science, indeed, may be diffused over the globe, like the light of the sun; while the millions who enjoy the benefits of both are as incapable of appreciating the one as of comprehending the other. The universities of the Nile and the Euphrates—in the former of which were graduated the illustrious Grecian masters, Thales, Pythagoras, Eudoxus and Plato—may have been surrounded by illiteracy and rudeness, as were the universities of the Ilissus and the Tiber centuries later, and as are those of the Cam and the Isis, of the Hudson and the Potomac, at the present day. No doubt, the Newtons and the Lockes, the Miltons and the Seldens, the Fultons and the Franklins lived and laboured then, as they have done since and are doing still, among a people not quite their peers in intellect or accomplishments. Such extremes and contrasts have always and everywhere prevailed. And they do not affect the question about the civilization of any country, ancient or modern.

Thus, France is a civilized country; and yet there are millions of Frenchmen who do not know the alphabet. But, in thus applying the term *civilized*, we do not stop to discriminate between the courtly Parisian *savant* and

the roughest provincial peasant. We pronounce the French nation, a civilized nation, and justly;—as we do the American republic—without excepting the three or four hundred thousand white persons over twenty years of age, who, according to the recent census, cannot write or read. For even these, uncultivated as they are, rise incomparably above the wild Indian and stupid Hottentot. And we mean the same thing when we speak of the civilization of ancient Egypt or Phoenicia. The whole people were civilized, as contrasted with savages; whatever distinctions may have obtained among themselves, or however vast the distance between either classes or individuals.

Again, there are diverse *forms* as well as *degrees* of civilization. Asiatic civilization has assumed a different type from the European; and, for centuries past, has ranked much lower in degree. The civilization of China is very unlike that of Germany, and probably much inferior to it. Yet, no person would confound the Chinese with the aborigines of New Holland, any more than he would consign the Germans to the same category with the natives of Congo and Oregon. I resort to this species of illustration to avoid any misapprehension about the precise meaning of the word *civilization*. Of this word, I have attempted no definition. I use it as custom has authorized. I speak of civilized nations and savage tribes, as existing facts, well known and universally understood. If there be any nations or tribes in a transition or doubtful state—so that they would not, by common consent, be assigned to the one or the

other of these grand divisions—I leave them out of the account.

I assert then, that the most ancient Egyptians known to history were civilized: as truly so, as were ever the Greeks or the Romans, or as now are the Britons or the Italians. With forms and degrees, I repeat, I have no controversy. Pass what sentence you please upon the remnants and ruins of Egyptian architecture, sculpture and painting; you will never pronounce them the work of savages. The builders of the stupendous temples at Thebes and Tentyra may possibly suffer somewhat in comparison with the artists who designed and embellished St. Peter's and St. Paul's at Rome and London; but no man will be hardy enough to insinuate that the former were savages.

But to return, for a moment, to the scriptural history. Whoever will peruse the Mosaic account of mankind, during the first ages after the flood, will discover no trace of barbarism, and no deficiency in the arts of civilized life. So early as the time of Abraham, we find a king in Egypt of the common name of Pharaoh, and a civil polity established, apparently of the same general character with that which prevailed in the days of Joseph and Moses, and which probably continued until the Persian conquest. The kingdom abounded in agricultural products, and afforded ample relief to strangers in seasons of famine. Moses represents the sovereign, who reigned at the time of the patriarch's temporary sojourn in that then most fertile and hospitable country, as a powerful and magnificent monarch, surrounded by

his princes and officers of state, maintaining a splendid and luxurious court, and exhibiting also much more magnanimity and moral principle than is usually to be met with in crowned heads among the ancients or the moderns. Several writers, particularly Goguet and Warburton, have contrasted the circumstances of Abraham's journey into Egypt and of his dismissal by Pharaoh, with those of a similar adventure on the part of Isaac with Abimelech, styled king of Gerar,—in which the superiority of an Egyptian monarch over a petty Philistine *sheik* or chief is strikingly manifested.

In the days of Jacob, the caravan of Ishmaelite merchants from Gilead, “with their camels bearing spicery, and balm, and myrrh,” and their ready purchase of Joseph as a slave, sufficiently indicate the nature of the market which Egypt then presented for the rarest commodities, as well as the safe and regular manner in which the overland foreign commerce was conducted. We read of a captain of Pharaoh's guard, of a chief butler and baker, and other important functionaries—of a distinct priesthood—of a prison, “where the king's prisoners were bound”—of “magicians and wise men”—and of sundry curious facts and incidents, rather casually glanced at than directly stated in the general narrative. “And Pharaoh took off his ring from his hand, and put it upon Joseph's hand, and arrayed him in vestures of fine linen, and put a gold chain about his neck; and he made him to ride in the second chariot which he had,” etc.; all evincing much luxury and refinement. And in the cities for the laying up of stores and provisions for the

approaching seven years of famine, we see the effects of wise government and of great national opulence. Soon after Joseph's death, we find the power and grandeur of the kingdom very significantly illustrated in the employment of the enslaved Israelites in building treasure cities, and in preparing materials for splendid public edifices. "Indeed, (adds Warburton,) if we may believe St. Paul, this kingdom was chosen by God to be the scene of all his wonders, in support of his elect people, for this very reason, that through the celebrity of so famed an empire, the power of the true God might be spread abroad, and strike the observation of the whole habitable world. 'For the Scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth.'" (Rom. ix. 17.)

The description of the Egyptian priesthood by Diodorus Siculus is worthy of notice in this connexion. "The whole country being divided into three parts; the first belongs to the body of priests, an order in the highest reverence among their countrymen, for their piety to the gods, and their consummate wisdom, acquired by the best education, and the closest application to the improvement of the mind. With their revenues they supply all Egypt with public sacrifices; they support a number of inferior officers, and maintain their own families: for the Egyptians think it utterly unlawful to make any change in their public worship; but hold that everything should be administered by their priests, in the same constant, invariable manner. Nor do they deem

it at all fitting that those, to whose cares the public is so much indebted, should want the common necessities of life: for the priests are constantly attached to the person of the king, as his coadjutors, counsellors and instructors in the most weighty matters. For it is not among them as with the Greeks, where one single man or woman exercises the office of the priesthood. Here a body or society is employed in sacrificing and other rites of public worship, who transmit their profession to their children. This order, likewise, is exempt from all charges and imposts, and holds the second honours, under the king, in the public administration." Moses also tells us that the Egyptian priests were a distinct and superior order, and had an established landed revenue; that when the famine raged so severely that the people were compelled to sell their estates to the crown for bread, the priests still retained theirs unalienated, and were supplied with corn gratuitously from the public stores. "Only the land of the priests bought he not: for the priests had a portion assigned them of Pharaoh, and did eat their portion which Pharaoh gave them: wherefore they sold not their lands." (Gen. xlvii. 22.) Diodorus gives us the reason of this indulgence, and corroborates the scriptural history; or, rather, is himself sustained by this venerable authority—although ignorant, probably, of its existence.

Herodotus says the inhabitants of Heliopolis were deemed in his time the most ingenious of all the Egyptians. The schools of its priesthood were famous for wisdom and learning. And Strabo, even so late as the

beginning of the Christian era, speaks of certain stately edifices as still remaining in that ancient city, which, as it was reported, had formerly been occupied by the priests, who cultivated the studies of philosophy and astronomy. This statement is incidentally confirmed by Moses. When Joseph was created *grand vizier* or prime minister of Egypt, Pharaoh "gave him to wife, Asenath, the daughter of Poti-phera, priest of On" or Heliopolis. All the circumstances of the case plainly show that the king was then disposed to do Joseph the highest honour: and the sound policy of this distinguished alliance is apparent from the passages already cited from the Greek historians. The sudden and extraordinary elevation of a stranger, over the heads of the hereditary administrators of public affairs, might have proved a dangerous experiment. The introduction of Joseph, therefore, into their own priestly order by marriage, was probably the best, if not the only expedient, calculated to allay their envy and prejudices, and to secure their cordial support and co-operation.

It is worthy of remark also, that, throughout this whole period from Abraham to Moses, the Scripture represents Egypt as an entire kingdom under one monarch, and not as distributed into a number of petty independent sovereignties, as most modern historians, from the imperfect traditions detailed by the Greeks, would lead us to believe. That Egypt might, in after times, have been thus temporarily divided among several tyrants or competitors for the throne, or that the powerful nobles or military commanders might, during the

reign of a weak prince or the minority of a young one, or at any other favourable crisis, have seized upon the crown and shared its honours among them, is very probable, and will account for the stories found in many writers about the confusions of ancient Egypt. Domestic feuds and animosities may have commenced at or soon after the exodus of the Israelites. At any rate, the prophets Isaiah and Ezekiel, centuries later, when predicting the desolation of Egypt by the Babylonians, speak of internal commotions and divisions as the principal cause of her deplorable weakness, and of her forty years' endurance of the most dreadful calamities ever inflicted upon a conquered enemy. "And I will set the Egyptians against the Egyptians; and they shall fight every one against his brother, and every one against his neighbour; city against city, and kingdom against kingdom." (Is. xix. 2.) "And I will make the land of Egypt desolate in the midst of the countries that are desolate, and her cities among the cities that are laid waste shall be desolate forty years: and I will scatter the Egyptians among the nations, and will disperse them through the countries." (Ezek. xxix. 12.) We must not confound the early with the later history of Egypt.

Nor are we to forget that, however much of error or fiction may have found its way into their historical statements, the more intelligent and travelled Greeks, with one voice, assigned to Egypt both the remotest antiquity and the highest wisdom and learning. Herodotus says that the Egyptians were the wisest of all nations, and that they were never beholden for anything to the Gre-

cians; but on the contrary, that Greece had borrowed largely from Egypt. All the Hebrew records support the Grecian evidence for the extreme antiquity and pre-eminent wisdom of the Egyptians. Thus, Isaiah, in denouncing the divine judgments against this people: "Surely the princes of Zoan (or Tanis) are fools, the counsel of the wise counsellors of Pharaoh is become brutish: how say ye unto Pharaoh, I am the son of the wise, the son of ancient kings? Where are they? Where are thy wise men?" (Is. xix. 12.)

I transcribe the following paragraph from Warburton, chiefly as furnishing a curious specimen of a kind of reasoning which is always convenient to the system-maker, and in the main abundantly satisfactory to the general reader. "This superior nobility of the priests of On or Heliopolis seems to have been chiefly owing to their higher antiquity. Heliopolis, or the City of the Sun, was the place where that luminary was principally worshipped; and certainly, from the most early times: for Diodorus tells us that, 'the first gods of Egypt were the sun and moon:' the truth of which, all this laid together remarkably confirms. Now if we suppose, as is very reasonable, that the first established priests in Egypt were those dedicated to the sun at On, we shall not be at a loss to account for their titles of nobility. Strabo says, they were much given to astronomy; and this too we can easily believe: for what more likely than that they should be fond of the study of that system, over which their god presided, not only in his *moral* but in his *natural* capacity? For whether they received the doctrine

from original tradition, or whether they invented it at hazard, which is more likely, in order to exalt this their visible god, by giving him the post of honour, it is certain they taught that the sun was in the centre of its system, and that all the other bodies moved round it, in perpetual revolutions. This noble theory came with the rest of the Egyptian learning into Greece, being carried thither by Pythagoras; who, it is remarkable, received it from Cænuphis, a priest of Heliopolis, and, after having given the most distinguished lustre to his school, it sunk into obscurity, and suffered a total eclipse throughout a long succession of learned and unlearned ages; till these times relumed its ancient splendour, and immovably fixed it on the most unerring principles of science.”

As to the very accommodating hypothesis or rather conjecture, that the Egyptian professors may have “invented at hazard” the sublime astronomical doctrine, taught in Greece by their accomplished pupil Pythagoras—a doctrine which never obtained currency among the Greeks—which subsequently, and after the lapse of more than twenty centuries, was revived by Copernicus, and finally demonstrated by Newton—the philosophers are heartily welcome to all the capital they can make of it. They must concede, at the least, that the Egyptian sages were shrewd and lucky *guessers*; and that their inventions *at hazard* were not always to be despised. With all becoming deference, however, to great names, and to superior erudition, I should venture to reverse the order; and to assume that their orthodox astronomical faith was grounded upon real science; and that the

science preceded the popular superstition, and gave rise to it. *When* or *how* they acquired this wonderful science, which *we* are only just beginning to learn—whether they derived it from Noah, and he from the father and first great teacher of mankind—or whether some gifted Galileo or Newton among themselves was its happy author—it were bootless to speculate. It is much easier to account for its ultimate and total disappearance—even long before the superstition which it generated had, in any degree, relaxed its ghostly dominion over the popular mind. The science itself may never have passed the limits of the sacerdotal colleges and royal observatories where it was studied and cherished; while the superstition was diffused among all ranks and embraced by the whole people.

The science, moreover, may have become obsolete or been lost among its privileged guardians and depositaries prior even to the dissolution of their priestly order. These may have neglected their high vocation as teachers and students—as has often happened in similar corporations since—from indolence, from the absence of all external stimulus or exciting motive, or from luxurious habits of self-indulgence: and thereafter, they may have been content with the results, the tables, rules, formulæ and calculations, already provided by their more diligent and faithful predecessors. They might continue to know the fact, and to believe the theory of the true solar system; just as multitudes of modern *gownsmen* know and believe, without being able to advance a single step to-

wards the actual demonstration. At any rate, the science must have perished beneath the desolating sweep of the Persian invader, who madly sought to bury, in the ruins of the temple and the palace, the religion, the learning, the arts and the glory of Egypt. The superstition, indeed, survived the rage, the fire and the sword of the ruthless victor. But the light of science was utterly extinguished; and its votaries were silenced forever. The later Greeks had ample opportunities to witness all the revolting absurdities of the Egyptian idolatry; while they could hear only a faint traditionary whisper of that splendid intellectual inheritance which had once adorned, enriched and exalted the Egyptian name above every other in the ancient world.

But, inasmuch as the bigoted Persians destroyed or rather annihilated all the written records, the libraries, books, archives, chronicles, annals—all the scientific apparatus and collections—which had been accumulating undisturbed for two thousand years; we, forsooth, are not to believe that the Egyptians ever possessed either literature or science! And we should, no doubt, be equally incredulous about Egyptian art, were it not for the still living and still speaking witnesses in every part of the land, upon either bank of the mysterious Nile, from the cataracts to the Mediterranean. But for these stubborn monuments, we should very logically conclude, that the present half-human *Copts* are fair specimens of Pharaoh's wise men—the instructors of Moses and Cecrops, of Solon and Pythagoras! And we are the

more especially predisposed to favour this mode of reasoning, since it is everywhere gravely asserted, that the East is unchangeable, and has never changed;—that habits, manners, usages, all things remain just as they were a score of centuries ago. So that whatever a galloping traveller or fashionable tourist happens to encounter or to espy, is incontinently jotted down as a veritable *fac simile* of what existed in the days of Abraham or Solomon;—as if invariable uniformity and absolute stability were predicable of regions which have undergone more revolutions, reverses, exterminating wars and plagues of all sorts—political, moral, religious and physical—than any other portions of the globe. It is time that this folly were rebuked, and that its abettors were sent to school.

I have said more of Egypt than my argument strictly demands. To show that Egypt was always civilized, and never otherwise—without claiming for it any extraordinary excellence or superiority—was abundantly sufficient to sustain the proposition which I have essayed to demonstrate.* Incidentally, I have adverted to a few par-

* Bryant indeed maintains, that the Mizraim, with their brethren the sons of Phut, migrated to their place of allotment, the Upper Egypt, a long time before the rebellion at Babel; that they there led a simple, rude, half-savage kind of life for several ages; that they were at length conquered and civilized by their brethren the *Cuthites* (the Titanic brood, as he styles them,) after they had been driven from Babylonia, etc.—His authorities, Diodorus Siculus among them, do not seem to warrant his hypothesis. But if admitted to be true, it would not invalidate our theory in the slightest degree. It would

ticulars which seem to indicate a very high order and degree of civilization. And much more, tending to the same result, might easily be adduced. Ever since the temporary occupancy of Egypt by the French, under Napoleon, the ruins of her pristine grandeur have been a *study* for the most profoundly learned, sagacious and philosophical antiquarians of Europe. They have not only visited the several remarkable localities, but have patiently, perseveringly and laboriously explored, investigated, deciphered, measured, compared, classified—until they have become familiar with the aspect, features, magnitude, proportions and style of those marvellous creations, which have resisted and survived the convulsions and the Vandalism of a hundred generations; and which seem destined to speak of the primeval ages and of the Pharaohs to the latest posterity. But into this tempting and opulent field, we must not venture. The pen and the pencil, however, have nobly accomplished their proper task; and volumes, full of instruction and of the most

merely change a little the order of events. It would show that the first settlers in a part of Egypt had greatly degenerated for a season: and that they were afterwards instructed and reclaimed by a colony direct from the fatherland—the original seat and fountain of civilization. Should all our facts and reasoning about Egypt be questioned or rejected, still our main position remains impregnable and unaffected. It can never be demolished, until it be proved that there was a time when civilization was unknown, and nowhere existed; or when all the inhabitants of our globe were savages. The philosophy which traces the civilized up to the savage state, or which deduces the former from the latter, demands this: and nothing less will meet the demand. Otherwise, the whole affair is a mere “*controversia verbi*.”

intensely exciting interest, are now within the reach of every man, who has the curiosity to read one of the most astonishing, as well as edifying passages in the history of our race. Not only do these recent researches fully confirm all the statements of the Hebrew and classical authors; but they add immensely to the previously conceded number and variety of arts and sciences, useful and liberal, which must have been cultivated and practised by the older Egyptians. It is difficult, indeed, to discover wherein they were deficient, or inferior to the modern European, while, in some respects, it is manifest they remain still unrivalled and peerless.

We are now able to comprehend and to appreciate the meaning of the significant scriptural phrase—"the wisdom of the Egyptians;" and the reason why Moses and the Grecian sages frequented their schools; and why, moreover, the latter spent so many years, not merely at one college, but oftentimes at different colleges, according to the objects which they had in view or the sciences to be acquired, before they deemed their education *finished*, or aspired to the honours of graduation. Thus, Lycurgus and Solon, the most eminent lawgivers among the Greeks, appear to have visited Egypt, chiefly to enlarge their acquaintance with the great principles of civil government and jurisprudence. The latter, as Plutarch informs us, received much useful instruction, on various important doctrines of philosophy and politics, from the priests at Sais. Thales and Eudoxus studied mathematics at Memphis. Pythagoras learned astronomy at Heliopolis.

Thence he passed successively to the other most renowned seminaries; in which, for twenty-two years, he prosecuted his inquiries, at the feet and under the guidance of the learned Gamaliels of the day, with the most untiring patience, docility, perseverance and enthusiasm. After this pretty thorough novitiate in Egypt, and after travelling into Chaldæa, Persia and Phœnicia in quest of knowledge, he returned to his own native Samos—there to be persecuted by the same fell spirit of ignorance, envy, prejudice and bigotry, which, in a later and Christian age, haunted and embittered the existence of Roger Bacon and Galileo. Finally, he established a school of his own at Crotona in Italy. And Plato too, the devoted disciple of Socrates during eight happy years, then a student of the Pythagorean philosophy in Magna Græcia, and of various sciences at other distinguished foreign schools, thought it necessary to attend the lectures of the Egyptian professors also, before he opened his own famous Academy at Athens. Verily, the Grecian scholars must have been sorry lads, or they could hardly have contrived to lounge away their entire youth and some ten or twenty years of mature manhood, among a set of dreamy pedagogues, who, agreeably to the vulgar faith, would have disgraced the *old field schools* of our own unparalleled Virginia! We, however, with these and many similar facts on record, should, in our extreme simplicity, be disposed to think it impossible for the most intrepid skepticism to deny to ancient Egypt the palm of pre-eminent wisdom and learning.

Of such pupils as Moses and Plato, her universities may have well been proud. And from the works and reputation of the pupil we may still judge of the master.

And if we bear in mind, that even Plato and most of the other Greeks did not visit Egypt until after the Babylonian and Persian invasions, when only the wreck of her former science remained, we shall be able to make some equitable allowance for the fragmentary character of their reports, and for the seeming contradictions and even absurdities which we occasionally find in their writings.

O, quam te dicam bonam
Antehac fuisse, tales cum sint reliquiæ?

But this paper must have an end. In preparing it, I have felt the difficulty of selection from the great mass of materials at hand, and especially of compressing within the limits of a readable article a small portion of the most prominent and pertinent facts which abound in ancient authors. These, if judiciously arranged and fairly interpreted, could scarcely fail to dissipate much of the prejudice, error and skepticism which prevail on this subject. I had designed to bring under review the arts and sciences actually known among the earliest postdiluvian nations; and to offer a few brief comments upon their literature, manners, customs, laws, religion and peculiar institutions. I had also marked a number of passages in sundry modern writers, with a view to point out the inconclusiveness of their reasoning, and its inconsistency oftentimes with the very premises which

they themselves admit. How much learned ingenuity, for example, has not been expended in attempts to depreciate or to get rid of the Egyptian claims to any respectable degree of proficiency in astronomy, mathematics, chemistry, metallurgy, physics, anatomy, navigation, geography, architecture, engraving, sculpture, painting, etc., merely because an arbitrary and inexorable theory seemed to demand a vastly longer time for such high attainments than any authentic history could furnish?

I conclude then with the remark, that if the Egyptians, Assyrians and Phoenicians never existed in a savage state; if their immediate progenitors, up to the age of Noah, were, like himself, civilized (and we proved, as we think, on a previous occasion, that man was created a civilized being, and thus continued down to the miraculous dispersion from Babel)—then it follows, that history cannot conduct us back to a period when the whole human race was savage; and consequently, that the philosophic and popular doctrine, that the *savage* was the original or primeval condition of mankind is indefensible;—that it is a mere gratuitous and baseless assumption;—and that the entire fabric, constructed by system-builders upon this foundation, is but a castle in the air, and can never withstand the artillery of reason, Scripture and history.

As before we traced the stream of civilization, as it issued pure and bright from the primitive fountain in Eden, throughout the antediluvian world, to the fertile

plains of Shinar; so now we can retrace it upwards till we arrive at the same point. The course is obvious, simple and direct. The civilization of modern Europe—of the Gauls, Germans, Britons, Goths, Vandals, Huns, Scandinavians, and the rest of the Northern barbarians—was derived from the Romans; as theirs had been from the Greeks; and theirs again from the Egyptians and other Orientals. Prior to these latter nations, savage life is unknown to either sacred or profane history.

THE ABORIGINES OF NORTH AMERICA.

[The following remarks may be regarded as a mere appendix of notes to the preceding articles upon The Primitive State of Mankind.]

I MENTIONED America among the countries doomed, probably soon after the flood, to be the abode of savages. I am aware that plausible objections have been urged against the opinion that America was known, or even inhabited, at a very early period. I am aware, also, that diverse theories have been contrived and advocated to account for the peopling of this vast continent. With these conflicting speculations, I do not mean to intermeddle at present.

But let it be remembered, that we have no authentic history of any country which was not inhabited *at the time* when it was first discovered or visited by civilized man. And who can pretend to tell us *when* or *how* the first inhabitants arrived there? Why are we to suppose that America was not peopled as soon as China and Japan, and Gaul and Britain, and the western and southern coasts of Africa? The reason assigned is, that, in those *rude ages*, as we are pleased to style them, men had not wit or knowledge enough to get there. They had not the means of transportation. They were ignorant of the arts of ship-building and navigation. Indeed!

And how do we know this? Could men, with the ark before their eyes,—the largest, strongest, safest ship that ever rode upon the shoreless deep, which had braved the fury of a forty days' tempest, and outlived the convulsions of a dissolving world,—be incapable of constructing a frail bark which might buffet the smooth waves of a summer's sea for a few short months, or weeks, or days? Or, after they had traversed the mountains and the plains of Tartary, and reached the northeastern extremities of Asia; what should have prevented their crossing the narrow strait which separates that continent from this? Or, in the opposite direction, might they not have passed over from the west of Africa, by that chain of islands which probably once connected that country with America, but which have long since been buried in the ocean? We are not bound, however, to devise or to explain the ways and means by which the Almighty may have chosen to execute his plans and purposes. If we can ascertain the latter, we may be satisfied that the former were both wise and adequate.

Moses informs us that, from the tower of Babel or the plains of Shinar, the people were dispersed over the whole earth. His words are: "So the Lord scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth." (Gen. xi. 8, 9.) That America had been submerged by the flood, and that the waters had retired from its surface at the same time as from the rest of the earth, is certain both from Scripture and from the researches of the modern geologist. At any rate, the science of geology can furnish no ground to presume that the New

World is of a more recent origin or formation than the Old. The characteristic phenomena of each are identical or analogous, and prove that both have been subjected to the same changes and influences, whatever these may have been, or however they may be accounted for or explained by any philosophical theory. That Moses, therefore, by *all the earth*, could mean only the half of it, is gratuitously imputing to him a latitude of expression which, it is believed, he was not in the habit of employing. I admit the fact, then, to have been precisely as he has recorded it. I do not question his integrity or accuracy, or even his philosophy in this or any other particular.

Now it is remarkable that in this, as in other cases where the Mosaic history has been impugned or but partially received, all the collateral or internal evidence, all the rational or philosophical considerations, and all the traditional or ethnical testimony, which can be made to bear upon the subject, go to confirm his statement in its literal sense and to the fullest extent. Those men who have recently studied the character, languages, rites, ceremonies, usages, traditions and history of the Indians with the greatest care, furnish ample materials to establish the opinion, that the Aborigines of America must be traced to a higher source than has usually been allotted to them; that they are indeed a primitive people; that they must have emigrated at a very early period; and that, in consequence of their complete separation from the rest of Noah's descendants, they have preserved a more distinct and homogeneous character and configura-

tion than probably can be found in any other extensive portion of the globe. Can any trace of such an occurrence be detected in the existing records of antiquity?

Some learned men suppose that Plato, in his *Timæus* and *Critias*, indicates pretty clearly that a knowledge of America, however obscure and imperfect, had once prevailed in Egypt. Should we admit with Crantor and Ammianus Marcellinus among the ancients, with Perizonius, Buffon, Bailly and Whitehurst among the moderns, that Plato's account of the lost Atlantis was in the main true, or founded in truth, and that he or his authorities had reference to a great western continent, then the problem of our aboriginal population could be solved without difficulty. "He commences (says Catcott) by mentioning a fact that happened in the most early ages, the nearest of any known to the beginning of the world; and that is, of a vast tract of land, or an island greater than Libya and Asia, situated beyond the bounds of Africa and Europe, which, by the concussion of an earthquake, was swallowed up in the ocean. Plato introduces this fact, as related by Solon, who, while he was in Egypt, had heard it of an old Egyptian priest, when he discoursed with him concerning the most ancient events. This priest tells Solon, that the Greeks, with regard to their knowledge in antiquity, had always been children; and then informs him of the history of this famous island, of which the Greeks knew nothing before." The description of this island, its catastrophe, and all the circumstances specified are so unique and extraordinary, that there must have been some ground in nature and

truth for the tradition. What that precise ground was, has greatly puzzled the critics; and their fanciful conjectures and speculations about the locality of Plato's Atlantis and of the *sea* which replaced it, or about the event which gave rise to the story, are probably not more pertinent or satisfactory than those presented by Catcott, which I proceed to recite.

“There was formerly (says Plato) an island at the entrance of the ocean, where the Pillars of Hercules stand [and consequently beyond the then supposed limits of Europe and Africa.] This island was larger than all Libya and Asia; and from it was an easy passage to many other islands; and from these islands to all that continent which was opposite, and next to the true sea [*ἀληθινὸν πόντον*, or Pacific Ocean.] Yet, within the mouth there was a gulf with a narrow entry. But that land, which surrounded the sea [*πέλαγος*, where the division was made] might justly be called a continent. In after times there happened a dreadful earthquake and an inundation of water, which continued for the space of a whole day and night; and this island, Atlantis, being covered and overwhelmed by the waves, sunk beneath the ocean, and so disappeared [*κατὰ τῆς θαλάσσης δῦσα ἠφανίσθη.*] And that the sea in this place has been ever since so filled with mud and sands, that no one can sail over it, or pass by it to those other islands on or near to the firm land.

“On this subject one may observe, that all historians and cosmographers, ancient and modern, call that sea, in which this island was engulfed, the Atlantic Ocean; retaining even the very name the island bore; which

seems a sufficient proof that there had been such an island. Admitting, then, the truth of this history, no one can deny this island, beginning near the straits of Gibraltar, to have been of that extent, from the north southward and from the east westward, as to be more than as large as Asia and Africa. By the other neighbouring islands are doubtless meant Hispaniola, Cuba, Jamaica, St. John's and those on the coast. By the continent or firm land, opposite to those isles, mentioned by Plato, is certainly meant that land which is now called North and South America. And one must not be surprised at this New World's not having been discovered by the Romans, or any of those other nations which, at different times, abode in Spain; because it may reasonably be imagined that the supposed difficulty of navigating this sea, mentioned by Plato, then remained." (*Augustin de Zarate*, a learned Spaniard of the sixteenth century, quoted by Catcott.)*

The Rev. Mr. Jones, in a letter to Catcott, comments thus on the passage: "Those who are inclined to slight it as allegorical, and think the earthquake described by Plato is incredible, because some fabulous circumstances are blended with the account, should endeavour to show us, what could possibly give rise to such a report in the

* The prevalent report or tradition that the new sea or Atlantic Ocean was unnavigable would, in all probability, have prevented any attempts to navigate it long after every real obstacle had been removed, or after the sea had acquired sufficient depth for the purpose.

The *true sea* mentioned by Plato, to which his continent, lying beyond the island Atlantis, was adjacent, is the Great South Sea or Pacific Ocean.

eastern world; for that Plato should so expressly describe an *opposite continent* such as is actually now discovered, together with the way that led to it from the straits of Gibraltar, and that this strange report should be grounded on no ancient knowledge of the American continent, and prove to be true afterwards only by accident,—all this would be more incredible than the matter reported, which, if the natural monuments of this great earthquake, still subsisting, are taken into the account, has all the appearance of truth that can be desired.” (The above correspondent of Mr. Catcott, I believe, was the Rev. William Jones, a learned clergyman of the Church of England, who died in 1801.)

Now, in support of Plato’s Egyptian story of a vast tract of land having been swallowed up in the ocean,—of which the Canaries, St. Matthew, St. Thomas, St. Helena, the Azores, the great Banks of Newfoundland, and the West India Islands are so many remaining fragments, standing like pieces of a wreck above the waves, and still exhibiting to us some footsteps, as it were, of the ancient path that once led from Africa to America; besides the evidence which these *ruins* themselves present; besides the evidence involved in the very nature of the tradition;—which, if fiction, must be pronounced the most extraordinary ever invented, since it has proved to be fact; besides the facility with which it accounts for all the phenomena of animal existence in this remote hemisphere; besides all the evidence in its favour, from these and similar considerations, additional confirmation is afforded, according to several eminent critics and com-

mentators, by Scripture itself when rightly interpreted. I offer no opinion of my own, either in regard to the statement from Plato, or in regard to the criticism on the sacred text which I am going to cite from Catcott. Both, whether true or false, are sustained by the authority of distinguished scholars. The reader will appreciate them according to his own judgment.

It were to be presumed *a priori*, it is argued, that Moses, in speaking of the migration of mankind towards re-peopling the earth, would make some mention, or give some hint or intimation, concerning the manner by which so large a part of the world, as the continent of America, became inhabited. And such there is reason to think he has done, and left recorded in the following remarkable passage: "And unto Eber were born two sons: the name of one was Peleg; for in his days was the earth divided." (Gen. x. 25; also 1 Chron. i. 19.) On these words Bengelius remarks, that Peleg was so named from the *division* of the *earth* which happened in his days. Now the genealogical and political divisions mentioned by Moses are always expressed by different words in the original Hebrew, as may be seen by recurring to Gen. x. 5, 18, 32, and xi. 9. But a very different kind of division is meant by the word *Peleg*; namely, a physical and geographical division, which happened *at once*, and which was so remarkable, and of such extent, as to justify the naming of the patriarch from the event. By this word *Peleg*, that kind of division is principally denoted which is applicable to land and water. Whence, in the Hebrew tongue, *Peleg* came to signify a river. In the Greek

πέλαγος, and in the Latin *Pelagus* denote the sea. From this precise meaning of the word, then, we may conclude that the earth was split or divided asunder for a very great extent, and the sea came between, in the days of Peleg; and that this was the *grand division* intended by the passage under consideration; and that soon after the confusion of tongues, and the dispersion of mankind upon the face of the whole earth, some of the sons of Ham, to whom Africa was allotted, went out of Africa into that part of America which now looks towards Africa; and the earth being divided or split asunder in the days of Peleg, they, with their posterity, the Americans, were, for many ages, separated from the rest of mankind. From all this it may be inferred that Africa and America were once joined, or at least separated from each other only by a very narrow gulf or strait, and that, some time after the flood (say, between the close of the first and third centuries, *in the days* or during the lifetime of Peleg,) the earth was divided or parted asunder, probably by means of an earthquake, and then this middle land sunk beneath the ocean. This is certainly a curious coincidence, to say the least, that Plato, whose information was derived through Solon from the Egyptian priests, is thus made to accord with Moses, who was profoundly skilled in all the wisdom and science of Egypt, when at the very acme of her glory, in arms, in policy and in arts.

“Thus we have discovered (concludes Catcott) an easy way by which America might have been, and I apprehend, the true way by which it really was, supplied with

inhabitants after the flood; a way this, that affords a very convenient passage, through a warm and fruitful climate, for the most tender and delicate animals, and such as could not endure any great degree of cold, and of course a very easy one for robust man.”*

If America was peopled from Africa, then the Indians of this continent are descended from Ham; and consequently lie under the prophetic curse pronounced by Noah upon their wicked ancestor. “And he said, cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren.” “God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant.” (Gen. ix. 25, 27.) How this malediction was finally accomplished upon the Canaanites, the Babylonians, the Phoenicians, the Carthaginians, the Egyptians, etc., is well known to every reader of the Bible and of

* The only copy of Catcott's work on the Deluge, which I have ever seen, belonged to the Library of Nassau-Hall. My extracts were made in 1820, during my residence at Princeton; and they are so mixed up with my own comments, that I may not have given him due credit for either the language or ideas which I have borrowed. My attention has been directed to Catcott and to my old manuscript notes, by two recent references to his book. 1. By John Delafield, in “An Inquiry into the Origin of the Antiquities of America.” He dissents from Catcott, Bengelius and Plato,—though for very insufficient reasons, as it appears to me. 2. By a writer in the January (1841) number of the Princeton Review, upon the “Origin of the Aborigines of America;” who quotes largely and approvingly from the identical volume, I presume, which, many years ago, awakened my own curiosity and led me to sundry inquiries and speculations relative to the ancient population of this continent,—a subject, with me, still *sub judice*. I have never seen the work of the Rev. John Dunmore Lang, D.D., and know nothing more of his theory than can be gleaned from the above Review and from a brief article or two in the New York Observer.

profane history. "The whole continent of Africa was peopled principally by the descendants of Ham; and for how many ages have the better parts of that country lain under the dominion of the Romans, and then of the Saracens, and now of the Turks!" (*Newton.*) And, it may be added, Africa has been, for centuries past, the common slave-mart and slaughter-house for all Christendom. "There never has been a son of Ham, who has shaken a sceptre over the head of Japheth. Shem hath subdued Japheth, and Japheth subdued Shem; but Ham never subdued either." (*Mede.*)

How exactly does the fate of the American savages correspond with the general destiny of Ham's posterity! They have been, without exception, conquered and enslaved, or reduced to a state of extreme vassalage; or they have been utterly exterminated, as were the nations of Palestine by the Israelites. How widely different their fate from that of the barbarous hordes of Northern and Western Europe, and of all the acknowledged descendants of either Shem or Japheth! Here is a phenomenon not easily explicable, except upon the hypothesis that they belong to the *doomed* race. And to this category, I should be disposed to assign them, from the very peculiarity of their fortunes, independently of mere ethnographical or other considerations. A like application of scriptural prophecy to the lost tribes of Israel might satisfy any candid mind that *they* can never be found among our native Indians. If they still exist here,—are yet to be discovered, recognized and restored to their ancient home or converted to the Christian faith,—it is

manifest that this wonderful event must soon take place, or there will not remain an *Indian* representative of that people upon our continent. The prophecies would thus be rendered nugatory, from the sheer want of subjects, upon whom or by whom they were to be fulfilled. Now the singular destiny of every branch of the Abrahamic family is its *miraculous preservation* amidst all sorts of calamities and dispersions; while that of the American savage is certain destruction,—complete, absolute, inevitable extinction from the face of the earth. At least, this is true in regard to those North American tribes among whom any traces of a Hebrew origin are supposed to have been discovered.

I do not advance this *prophetic* argument to sustain the *Atlantis* of Plato or the *logic* of Catcott. The former is a distinct, substantive, independent, and hitherto unoccupied ground. The latter may be rejected; and so may every other theory about the ancient highway from the Old World to the New. And yet the Indians *may* be the descendants of Ham,—either from Asia or Africa. If from the latter, it does not follow that they must have been of the negro or Ethiopian race. None of the Asiatic *Hamites* were negroes. Nor is it probable that the primitive inhabitants of northern Africa, along the shores of the Mediterranean, from the Nile to the Straits of Gibraltar, were negroes. And from *these* must have issued the early colonies which settled the lost Atlantis, (if such an island ever existed,) and, at length, America. Soon after reaching the latter, they were suddenly and forever cut off from all future communication with their eastern

brethren, by the earthquake which buried beneath the waves of the new Atlantic Ocean, the intervening land together with its entire population. Now we can easily suppose the condition, character and circumstances of the forlorn, destitute, isolated remnant that survived and were compelled to subsist as best they could in this gloomy wilderness, to have been such, that they naturally and speedily degenerated into savages; as did their kindred throughout central and southern Africa.

Nor does my argument from prophecy require that *all* the aborigines of this continent should be the offspring of Ham. The Esquimaux, for instance, belong to the *Mongolian* race according to Blumenbach, and are presumed to be descendants of Japheth. There may be others of the same family. Some tribes also may be identified, perhaps, with the South Sea Islanders and the Asiatic Malays. There is ample scope for exceptions, and for diversity of opinions in regard to several clans or nations. Theorists, moreover, are welcome to all the capital which they can make of the Mexicans, Peruvians, Natchez and Bogotians. So striking, however, is the resemblance between the aboriginal tribes in every part of the country, from Labrador to Cape Horn, that they are generally regarded by naturalists as constituting but one distinct *variety* of the human species. The great mass of them also appear evidently subjected to the *same* deplorable destiny; namely, bondage or extermination at the hands of *Christian* Japheth,—a destiny without a parallel, on so large a scale, in the history of man, and altogether inexplicable, except upon the assumption that

they are the posterity of Ham, and are therefore still enduring the grievous penalty denounced upon them more than four thousand years ago.

Nor do the marvellous ruins of splendid cities and colossal structures in Mexico and Central America, in the least, affect the argument or the general facts. That these were not the work of savages is conceded. The builders of Memphis, of Babylon, of Tyre, of Carthage were quite competent to the task, no doubt. And these were all legitimate *Hamites*. Whether they had any agency in the affair or not, I leave Messrs. Stephens and Catherwood to answer.* If it be objected *in limine*, that none of those enterprising ancients could possibly have found their way thither, be it so. Then get over or out of the difficulty as best you can. If *they* could not, pray who *could*, and who *did*? There lie the ruins, as palpable, as stupendous, as eloquent, as those of glorious old Thebes. The founders and citizens of both have alike passed away; and, but for a few slight historical and poetic notices of the latter, we should at this day be as ignorant of the one as of the other. And we should no more think of ascribing the gigantic monuments of the Nile to the servile Copt or Bedouin Arab, than we now do those at Palenque to the indigenous Mexican. The only rational mode in such case is to cut the Gordian knot forthwith and without flinching. When we meet, in the desert or wilderness, with a *Tadmor* of stately

* This article was prepared before the publication of Mr. Stephens' work on Central America, and was forwarded to the editors of the Repository before any copy of that work had reached Nashville.

palaces and temples, let us have faith in adequate human agency, and take for granted that the ingenious Greek or his more accomplished master had been there, whether we can prove it or not. If the works in question shall be found to belong to the old Egyptian or Phœnician school of architecture, never doubt that the Egyptian or Phœnician navies once frequented the adjacent seas: and that upon these shores were some of those far distant, and to the rest of the world, unknown ports, with which they were in the habit of commercial intercourse; and that they reared and embellished the magnificent cities which have just begun to excite our curiosity and astonishment.*

* Ælian states, on the authority of Theopompus, that, at a certain conference between *Midas*, the Phrygian, and the sage or demigod, *Silenus*, the latter, among other strange matters, informed his friend *Midas*: “That Europe, and Asia, and Libya were islands, which the ocean entirely surrounded; and that the country which was situated beyond their own part of the world was alone the true continent; that it was of boundless extent; that it nourished animals of a different kind and of immense size [the mammoth, megatherium, mastodon, missourium, etc.—no doubt;] that the men there were twice as large, and that they lived twice as long as other mortals; that there were many populous cities, and many peculiar modes or forms of life,—with laws and customs directly contrary to their own.” *Silenus* goes on to describe two remarkable cities in particular, totally unlike each other; the one, a city of WAR [*Μάχιμος*,] the other of PIETY [*Εὐσεβής*]—the latter, of course, very good and very happy; the former always at war, and, with a population of some two millions, making sad havoc among their neighbours. He mentions also “an exploring expedition” undertaken by a company of adventurers, consisting of only about *ten millions*, whose aim was to cross the wide ocean and visit their kindred in the eastern world—or, “to pass over to these islands of ours,” as the worthy *Silenus* hath it. That after a successful voyage (by way of Greenland, Iceland, etc., as I take it,) they marched onward till

But, it will be urged, that they knew nothing of the mariner's compass. This again is a perfectly gratuitous and unavailing objection. For if they could not possibly reach our coast without the compass, and yet did actually reach it,—why, then, I suppose, we must allow them the benefit of the compass also. I do not assert that they used the compass, or that it was indispensable to their navigation. The objector has created the dilemma which demands it. Independently, however, of this hypothetical presumption, there is ground to believe that the compass has been known, from time immemorial, among the Chinese and other Orientals; and that it could hardly have been unknown among the Phœnicians and Egyptians. The immense fleets of Sesostris, the extensive voyages of the Phœnicians from the days of Sidon to the destruction of Tyre, those performed by order of Solomon, the circumnavigation of Africa under Pharaoh Nechos,

they came in contact with the honest and courteous Hyperboreans, “esteemed the happiest people among us;” whom they affected to despise, and therefore disdained to proceed any further—upon such a fool's errand; with sundry other equally marvellous and no less creditable facts and events;—for all which the curious reader may, at his leisure, consult the aforesaid most judicious and faithful Ælian. (Var. Hist., lib. iii. c. 18.)

But seriously, the nonsense of Ælian has been fairly matched by the modern stories of American Amazons, Patagonian giants, Yankee sea-serpents, etc.—to say nothing of the famous fountain, which was long believed to possess the property of bestowing perpetual youth; and in search of which *Juan Ponce de Leon* discovered Florida, in 1512. By-the-way, this very tradition may have been derived from or through Ælian, since he speaks of a similar fountain or river of *rejuvenescence* in the chapter above cited. How much of *truth* may have served as the *germ* of his narrative or fiction, is still a subject of grave controversy among the critics and scholiasts.

the naval prowess and commercial grandeur of Carthage, the exploring expeditions and discoveries of Hanno and Himilco,—all proclaim a degree of skill and knowledge in seamanship, far surpassing anything recorded of the Greeks and Romans, and which it would be difficult to account for, without conceding to them some means or instruments never possessed by the latter. That the Phœnicians took every precaution to conceal “the secret of their navigation” from other nations is well known, and has never been denied. Might not the mariner’s compass have been among the things thus studiously concealed? Several learned men—Pineda, Kircher, Sir William Drummond and others—have laboured to prove that these primitive navigators were acquainted with the *directive* properties of the magnet, and that they actually employed the compass or some similar instrument.*

However this may be, no one can read the glowing descriptions of their ships and commerce and naval enterprise and unparalleled opulence contained in the Bible, without feeling the conviction that neither the Greeks nor the moderns have ever accorded to them *more* than justice. I request the timid or skeptical reader to turn to the 27th and 28th chapters of Ezekiel, and to the 23d of Isaiah; and when he has carefully perused and pon-

* For a brief view of the claims of the Chinese, etc., see Klaproth’s Letter to A. Humboldt; also, article “Compass, The Mariner’s,” in the Penny Cyclopædia.

The journals, charts, log-books, etc. of the old Phœnician captains, will, when discovered, probably shed some light not only upon the *Atlantis* and *Ophir*, but upon sundry other matters of considerable interest to the curious.

dered each graphic phrase of the inspired record, let him search our world over for the city which can now be compared with ancient Tyre,—“the crowning city, whose merchants were princes,”—the then proud mistress of the ocean, and the grand emporium of a traffic which apparently extended to every port and people upon the globe. Such gorgeous language, if applied to any modern Venice or London, would be deemed not merely extravagant and hyperbolic, but positively absurd. So far then from being incredible, it might be assumed as highly probable, that the Phœnicians should have visited America, and planted colonies or established trading factories in the vicinity of its richest mines of gold and silver. If so, we can readily account for the amazing quantities of the precious metals with which they supplied the nations; and perhaps even the *Ophir* of Solomon may yet be claimed for our modest hemisphere.*

* The geographical position of *Ophir* has given rise to much learned speculation. Basnage mentions several writers, chiefly Jewish, who place it in Peru; or who rather make the names *Ophir* and *Peru* identical, by a mere transposition of the radical letters in the original Hebrew. This may be as orthodox etymology as that which would derive *Potomac* from the Greek word ποτομῶς, a river.

From Diodorus Siculus (lib. v. c. 19, 20) we gather the following particulars: “At a great distance from Africa to the west there lies in the vast ocean a very large island; having a fruitful soil, lofty mountains and navigable rivers. Formerly it was unknown on account of its very remote situation from the rest of the world. But at length the Phœnicians, who in the most ancient times were in the habit of making distant voyages for the purposes of trade, being driven thither by violent winds and tempests, became acquainted with its value and importance; and thus introduced it to the knowledge and notice of

But I do not require the Atlantis of Plato or the ships of Tyre in order to furnish a passage for the original emigrants to this continent. Even in the present relative positions of the land and water, no very formidable obstacles exist; and ways enough have been pointed out, by which the rudest savage could pass from the one continent to the other. The chief difficulty, after all, is to find or devise a passage for many species of the inferior animals. These could neither have come by water nor over the ice. If all terrestrial animals were destroyed, except those preserved in the ark, we must admit the necessity of some practicable mode by which they could get here. No merely local or subsequent creations, or partial escapes from the diluvial catastrophe, will meet the case on scriptural grounds.* Here, then, there would

some other nations, particularly the Tuscans, who attempted to plant a colony in it, but were prevented by the Carthaginians, who had become the most powerful people at sea," etc. Wesseling, in his notes on the above, supposes that an island adjacent to America, or that America itself was referred to. At least, after disposing of the Fortunate and other islands, as not suiting the historian's description, he asks: "Ergone una earum est, quæ Americæ adjacent, ipsave America?" We learn, moreover, that the Carthaginians, who were acquainted with this transatlantic country, wished to conceal its situation, not only from a fear that their citizens would emigrate thither on account of its superior advantages, but also that they might secure a safe retreat in the event of an unsuccessful war. Possibly, this mysterious concealment by the Punic navigators may have occasioned the report and belief, that the entire island or continent had been lost or buried in the ocean. For when sought by others, it could not be found. (See Wesseling's edition, vol. i. pp. 344, 345. See also a work ascribed to Aristotle, *De Mirabil. Auscult.*)

* "And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon

seem to be no alternative, but the unqualified admission, either that the continents were once united in the manner already indicated, or that Asia was formerly joined to America, in the more southern latitudes; and that the innumerable islands in the Pacific Ocean are the higher parts of the land which completed, above water, the connexion between the Old World and the New. Perhaps the earth was one continuous body of land for a century or two or three after the flood, and until after the dispersion of men and other animals over its surface; and that *then* occurred the grand physical division in the days of

the earth, and every man; all, in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died." (Gen. vii. 21, 22.)

No embarrassment need be created by the fact, if *fact* it be, that some species are found on the one continent which are unknown to the other. If any animals exist in America, for instance, which are not in the eastern hemisphere, they have become extinct in the latter since the period of their first migration hither. If any exist in the Old World, which are not in the New, we have only to infer, either that they never came here, or that they have become extinct since their arrival. He would be a bold man, however, who should presume to dogmatize on this subject, until he may have become somewhat acquainted with the immense regions of both continents, which have hitherto escaped the notice alike of philosopher and traveller. Perhaps, too, our zoology, our physiology, and our geology, may need some new modifications or *improvements*, before we can pronounce with certainty even upon the scanty materials already within the scope of scientific scrutiny.

If Moses has recorded the literal truth, namely, that every living creature upon the face of the whole earth perished by the flood, except such as were in the ark with Noah, as I doubt not he did, then we have a safe starting-point, a fixed datum, from which and with which to commence our researches. Can it be demonstrated that any terrene animals *now* exist, which did not originate from those preserved in the ark? Nothing short of *demonstration* will invalidate the positive scriptural testimony in the slightest degree.

Peleg, by the breaking up of the exterior crust and the bursting forth of the central waters, which have ever since covered the larger portion of the globe, and thus effectually prevented a reunion of the scattered families, and hindered many a Nimrod or Alexander from conquering and laying waste the whole world. This latter suggestion, luckily, is secure from the assaults of the geologist, as it leaves him no visible *ground* to stand upon; and he will hardly search for it at the bottom of the ocean. The striking resemblance between the men and brutes of northeastern America and northwestern Europe, shows the intimate connexion which once subsisted between the continents in the higher latitudes, while Greenland, Iceland, Spitzbergen, etc., still remain both as evidences and monuments of the ancient physical union. Asia and America are sufficiently near to each other to enable us, by the occasional aid of a bridge of ice across Behring's Straits, to meet the animal phenomena peculiar to that region.

Again, as it was manifestly one of the great purposes of the Almighty, that the whole earth should be peopled forthwith, so I suppose this purpose was effected in the usual way; namely, by mingling mercies with judgments, parental tenderness with parental chastisements. Thus, by the confusion of tongues men were *punished* and obliged to desist from a wicked enterprise, and to obey the divine command by emigrating in all directions to distant lands,—thence never to return. They went to the polar and to the equatorial regions; to live, not to *perish*, amidst the snows and frosts of the one, and

the burning sands and sultry blasts of the other. Did the Deity make no seasonable and kindly provision for these wandering outcasts? Were they to incur the fearful hazards incident to the most violent changes of climate, food and habitudes of all sorts,—without preparation, without protection, without any knowledge or anticipation of the evils to be encountered? I think not. What then was done to accommodate man to his new situation and altered circumstances? Precisely what the exigency demanded and divine wisdom directed. Now it is remarkable, that no *new* variety of man has been discovered or gradually produced, within the period of authentic history. All the physical attributes which *now* distinguish the inhabitants of different countries, were just as palpable and as strongly marked when they first appear upon the stage. From Japan to Britain, from Nova Zembla to the Cape of Good Hope, man has been ever the same since first noticed in history. The *Caucasian* and the *Negro*, the *Malay* and the *Mongol*, have continued to be what they apparently were from the beginning. “Can the Ethiopian change his skin?” had become a proverb among the most ancient nations, to denote an impossibility;—clearly proving that the *black skin* was a well-known fact, as well as an indelible characteristic of a portion of mankind. If nature, by a certain, regular, invariable process, has really effected all the existing diversities in the human family, she must have completed her work, or exhausted her resources, some three thousand years ago. For, assuredly, she has attempted nothing of the kind since. So, whether we ascribe the

radical changes in question to a direct act of the Deity, like the confusion of speech, or to the operation of ordinary physical causes, we are constrained to admit that the whole was achieved at a very remote period; and most probably, because then most needed, at the epoch of the dispersion. Such indeed was the very kind of adaptation to the peculiarities of their new position, which was called for on the score both of necessity and benevolence. The American variety is doubtless as old as any other. It cannot be proved to be more recent. Nor are we to confound physiological with genealogical distinctions. The Phoenicians were of the Caucasian race,—but of the family of Ham, equally with the Hottentot and the American savage.

I do not mean to deny, nor do I wish to underrate the modifying or transforming influences of climate, food, manner of living, etc., upon the persons and constitutions of mankind. These are visible and obvious everywhere. I more than doubt, however, the theory which ascribes to these and similar causes all the distinct varieties in the human species. These appear to be permanent; and none of them can be traced to any definite historic origin. They never lose their specific attributes; they never glide into one another, nor exhibit anomalous forms or aspects, except by intermarriages. Were the negro to reside in England a thousand years, he would be a negro still, provided his race continued without mixture. The Caucasian, with the same proviso, would never become a negro under any circumstances or in any latitude. Partial and temporary changes are not to be confounded

with hereditary and abiding differences. The complexion, for example, is easily affected. But restore the Caucasian of darkest hue to the home and habits of his fathers, and his children will be as fair as the rest of his kindred.* To this branch of the subject, I cannot of course do justice in a few sentences. I can neither present my own views fully, nor meet with becoming respect the widely different opinions of eminent philosophers and theologians.

I notice another objection which has been urged against the early peopling of America; namely, that the population of the Old World was utterly inadequate to the purpose, within the days of Peleg, or even for many centuries afterwards. The fallacy of this objec-

* I attach but little importance to the case of the black Jews, said to be found in India. They are probably a mixed race at most. The Jews never object to marriages with proselytes; and they have seldom been averse to the making of proselytes to their faith, when it could be done without danger. But it remains to be seen, whether even the black colour would not disappear upon their return to a more congenial land; if they are indeed the genuine descendants of Israel, and if they have preserved the purity of the Hebrew blood amidst all their wanderings and adverse vicissitudes. This, after all, is but an instance of a partial change. Other similar cases may be disposed of in like manner. The great fact still remains, namely, that no *new variety* has been formed within the period of human history, and that none such is now in course of formation. With the mixed races, I repeat, the argument has no concern. *Amalgamation* may achieve marvels or create oddities, but it will never demolish history, philosophy or Scripture. Mere sporadical varieties, like the *Porcupine* family in England, and *Albinos* everywhere, are entitled to no special notice in connexion with any theory. The black Portuguese and the bronzed Europeans, of all sorts, found in Africa and Asia, assuredly do not prove either a transition from one distinct physiological variety to another, or the creation of any new variety.

tion has been shown by several learned men. Thus, Picart supposes that there might have been 432,000,000 of inhabitants upon the earth at the close of the first 150 years after the flood. Petavius estimates the population of the world at the birth of Peleg, or about 101 years after the flood, at 32,768. Bishop Cumberland gives 30,000 for the same date. According to Mede, there were or might have been at the time 7000 *men*, besides women and children. Usher is of opinion, that in the 102d year after the flood, mankind might have increased to the number of 388,605 males, and as many females, or to a grand total of 777,210. This uncommon increase he ascribes to an extraordinary fecundity implied in that repeated command or blessing: "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth." (Gen. ix. 1.) If we allow this number to have doubled every twenty years, we shall find the amount within a fraction of 800,000,000 at the end of 300 years after the flood—or fifty years before the death of Noah, and forty before that of Peleg. Any approximation, however, to this vast multitude, would dissipate every objection to our argument. A few facts, out of many hundreds on record, will further illustrate and confirm the general views already presented.

Within the space of 215 years, (Samaritan Pentateuch and St. Paul,) the posterity of Jacob alone amounted to 603,550 males "from twenty years old and upward," all able to go forth to war, exclusive of the Levites. (Num. i. 45, 46.) Add women and children, the aged and infirm, together with the entire tribe of Levi, and the whole

multitude could not have been less than three or four millions. Now they were not only slaves, but were subjected to the most rigorous treatment which a subtle and jealous policy could devise. They were commanded to destroy their own male infants; were crowded together in a corner of a populous empire; and were kept at hard labour under cruel taskmasters, whose main object was, not merely to extort the utmost profit from their service, but absolutely to crush them beneath the burdens and privations imposed.

Egypt, too, was proverbially populous. If we believe the account given by Diodorus of the 1700 male children born on the same day with Sesostris, and afterwards made officers in his army, then it will follow, according to a computation made by Goguet on purpose to ridicule the story of the Greek historian, that there must have been at least 60,000,000 of inhabitants in Egypt at that early period. The army of Sesostris, we are told, consisted of 600,000 foot and 24,000 horse, besides 27,000 armed chariots, with a fleet of 400 sail on the Red Sea, and as many perhaps in the Mediterranean. His conquests extended from the Ganges to the Danube. Herodotus expressly says: "The reign of Amasis was auspicious to the Egyptians, who under this prince could boast of twenty thousand cities well inhabited." (Euterpe, 177.) The statements of Herodotus and Diodorus may be treated as apocryphal; still, there is abundant evidence in Scripture that the population of Egypt could not have been greatly exaggerated. Pray, what else had the Egyptians to do, during the seven years' famine in

Joseph's time, except to build cities? "And as for the people, he removed them to cities, from one end of the borders of Egypt, even to the other end thereof." (Gen. xlvii. 21.) "During the inundation of the Nile, the cities only are left conspicuous, appearing above the waters like the islands of the Ægean Sea." (Herod. Euter. 97.) Moses and Herodotus agree very well, so far as cities are concerned. Egypt was of much larger extent in ancient times than at present. The shifting sands of the desert have been steadily encroaching upon its once fertile plains, and thereby diminishing its habitable territory, probably ever since the Persian conquest.

Not long after the coronation of Saul, "the Philistines gathered themselves together to fight with Israel, thirty thousand chariots, and six thousand horsemen, and people as the sand which is on the sea-shore in multitude." (1 Sam. xiii. 5.) The Philistines possessed a narrow strip of land along the sea-coast, in the southwest of Canaan, about forty miles long, and fifteen broad. "And it came to pass that in the fifth year of king Rehoboam, Shishak, king of Egypt, came up against Jerusalem with twelve hundred chariots, and sixty thousand horsemen, and the people were without number that came with him out of Egypt." (2 Chron. xii. 2, 3.) Abijah, son of Rehoboam and grandson of Solomon, "set the battle in array with an army of valiant men of war, even four hundred thousand chosen men. Jeroboam also set the battle in array against him with eight hundred thousand chosen men, being mighty men of valour." (2 Chron. xiii. 3.) "And Asa had an army of men that bare tar-

gets and spears, out of Judah three hundred thousand; and out of Benjamin, that bare shields and drew bows, two hundred and eighty thousand; all these were mighty men of valour. And there came out against them Zerah the Ethiopian, with a host of a thousand thousand (*i.e.* a million) and three hundred chariots; and came unto Maresah." (2 Chron. xiv. 8, 9.) According to Josephus, the whole number slain and taken prisoners by the Romans, during the seven years' war, was 1,462,000. What must not great Babylon have been at the height of its glory, when Seleucus Nicator, soon after the death of Alexander, could drain it of above 500,000 persons to people his new city of *Seleucia*, forty-five miles northward? And this, too, after Babylon had been repeatedly taken, sacked and pillaged by hostile armies.

Let the reader carefully examine the scriptural statistics of the numerous armies, which converted the land of Judea into one great battle-field, from the days of Joshua till the final destruction of Jerusalem; let him reflect upon the descriptions of Nineveh and Babylon, and of many other cities as well as kingdoms; let him abate as much from the letter of the text as Michaelis, Eichhorn and other wise biblical critics, as much as Gibbon, Niebuhr and other modern historians, as much as Hume, Kaimes and all the philosophers may summarily require; still, he cannot doubt but that Palestine and the neighbouring countries once contained a population incomparably greater than at the present day, unparalleled, perhaps, in modern times, except in the empires of China and Japan.

Delhi, formerly the capital of Hindostan, the boast of India, and the seat of the great Mogul, was estimated to contain 2,000,000 of inhabitants. *Pekin*, according to information given to Lord Macartney, contains no less than 3,000,000. *Jeddo*, in 1812, as the Japanese stated to Golowan, had a population of 10,000,000! I do not vouch for the strict accuracy of these figures; and the reporters cannot be easily questioned just now. *Thebes* was believed by the Egyptians, according to Diodorus, to have been the first city founded upon the earth; and we certainly have no account of any more ancient since the flood. Its population has been *calculated* from sundry hints and traditionary fragments, variously, at from one to twenty millions. Its most flourishing period preceded the building of Memphis. Its remains at this day testify that the oldest city in the world has probably never been surpassed in architectural grandeur; and that even its population may not have been greatly exaggerated by either poet or historian. Strabo says that, in his time, *Epirus* was thinly inhabited, but that according to Theopompus, whom he cites, it had once been extremely populous. Paulus Æmilius, we are told, destroyed seventy cities in Epirus, and took 150,000 prisoners? Who believed this? At length, M. Pouqueville, during a long residence in the dominions of the late Ali Pasha, actually discovered the remains of sixty-five cities, quite able to speak for themselves. I have somewhere seen an estimate which makes the population of the Roman empire, in the age of Augustus, to have been 4,000,000,000. Gibbon, I believe, reduces it to about 120,000,000 in the

reign of Claudius. Even this will do,—especially when it is recollected that, like Goguet, Millot, Hume, etc., the author of the “Decline and Fall” was always rather partial to the “rule of reduction.” But of such details and speculations there is no end.

If there be, however, any semblance of truth in the Bible and in other ancient authorities, we must concede that the whole world of which they treat was densely populated. They never speak of any country, indeed, which, at the time, was destitute of inhabitants, or which does not appear to have been well filled with inhabitants. Sesostris and Alexander, though a thousand years asunder, found the far East teeming with a population as redundant as ever swarmed upon the banks of the Nile. The Roman conquerors experienced no lack of hostile numbers in their marches through the remotest and most ungenial climes. In Africa, in Asia, in Gaul, Germany, Britain, Scythia, everywhere, they met and encountered host after host; and the wonder is, after reading their own accounts of the battles and the slain, that the earth had not been utterly depopulated and converted into a dreary wilderness.

I cannot doubt, therefore, that the world was vastly more populous during the whole period which intervened from the age of Noah to that of Constantine, than it has been at any time since. Population diminished rapidly after the decline and fall of the Roman empire. It continued to diminish during the dark ages. And it has been on the advance only within the last two or three centuries. I speak chiefly of countries known to history.

As to the Chinese and some other Oriental nations, they may have suffered less in this respect; and they may still serve as a specimen and index of what the population of other nations may once have been. China at this day, with a territory considerably smaller than that of the United States, is supposed to contain nearly half the population usually allotted to the whole world. They are, too, the most industrious, intelligent, contented, happy, peaceful, orderly, age-honouring, home-keeping and *specie-paying* people on the globe. And they would be the most temperate also, if *Christian* avarice would let them alone. What would be the population of the earth, if it were everywhere equal to that of China? Why may it not thus have been? Why should it not thus be? The very prospect, nay, the possibility of such an event would annihilate the *Malthusian* heresy, with all its unchristian dogmatism, and unsocial restraints, and arbitrary provisions, and terrific conclusions. Happily, it has not yet invaded or disturbed the repose of the Celestial Empire.

I think, then, we may warrantably conclude that, before the death of Peleg (according to any chronological system) the earth *might* have been peopled throughout its entire extent; and that there were, at the birth of Peleg, inhabitants enough to furnish colonies for every principal division or important locality upon the globe.

The doubts, suspicion and incredulity so generally manifested in regard to a large portion of the (so called) extraordinary facts, personages, events and statistics, mentioned by ancient writers, have resulted from the

prevalent but groundless assumption, that they all pertain to a rude and barbarous age; and are therefore to be regarded as fictions or exaggerations. Their hypothesis about the *primitive state* is a perpetual stumbling-block at every turn. Until they set out right, they will never interpret correctly or estimate fairly the works, the archives or the character of antiquity. Their *theory* obscures and circumscribes their vision. It exacts from their judgment a verdict at variance with all sorts and degrees of evidence. Not only must every ancient profane document yield to this arbitrary test, but the Bible itself cannot escape their critical tortures, or conjectural emendations, or supercilious disregard. It constrains them to “beg the question,” to reason in a circle, and to avail themselves of “trifles light as air” to uphold their baseless fabric. The Greeks and the Romans are their standard of perfection, by which to measure all other ancient nations; and the remoter were any of these, in either time or space, so much the worse is the sentence awarded. Because the Greeks and Romans did not know *this*, or could not do *that*, therefore the Phœnicians and Egyptians must have been still more ignorant and less capable. And by the same rule, the contemporaries of Noah and Adam were little better than children and infants. The old Egyptians could not construct an arch; *ergo* they were but clumsy novices in architecture, and consequently in all the arts. True, they were able, without mechanical science, and by mere brute force, “to pile Ossa upon Pelion,” but too stupid to build a Dutch oven or a cabbage vault; when, lo! the arch is discovered in

the catacombs and among the mummies of the Pharaohs, in the temples which for ages had been forgotten and buried beneath the sands of the desert, in the bosom of the great pyramid, which had grown hoary with years, centuries before the Parthenon or Coliseum had been dreamt of! The aborigines of America knew nothing of the arch or of iron, nothing of butter, cheese, roast-beef or wheaten bread; therefore they must have sprung from an ancestry equally rude and helpless; or they must have come hither before those wonderful mysteries had been revealed to mankind in the old world!

Here I may add, that theories about the American Indians are generally formed from exceedingly imperfect data—often from no data at all—and that the same facts and observations sometimes lead to directly conflicting theories. Thus, I am acquainted with intelligent individuals in Tennessee, who have resided many years among the Cherokees and profess to know them thoroughly, who differ widely in their deductions respecting their origin and national affinities. One, a most respectable clergyman, at present a citizen of Nashville, is perfectly satisfied from his own personal investigations among the natives, that they are the genuine descendants of Israel's long-lost ten tribes. Of the same opinion was a late learned judge of our supreme State court. Both have written ably in support of their views; which accord, in the main, with those of Adair and Boudinot. Others refer them, as well as the adjacent tribes, to the nomadic races of Northern Asia; and others again, to the Southern Malays. I have been strongly inclined to

the latter opinion myself, both from a slight inspection of a few Indians and still fewer Malays at different times and places, and from the statements and reasoning of more competent observers. It is probable that Asia and Europe, as well as Africa, have contributed more or less to the population of this continent. How do we know after all that the *Mongols* are not descended from Ham? I mean the Mongols of the naturalist, as distinguished from the Indo-Germanic hordes and Caucasian Tartars, with whom they have been long mingled and often confounded. It might be rather difficult also to prove that the *Malays* are of the Semitic stock, or that they too are not the posterity of Ham. It would be curious, if all the degraded and *degrading* varieties of the human species, namely, the Negro, the Mongol, the Malayan and the American, should appear at length to belong to the great family of the African patriarch.

But it was not my purpose in these notes to propound, much less to advocate any new or peculiar theory. On the whole, however, I favour the hypothesis, that the indigenous Americans have occupied this continent from the earliest times—that they came hither at the epoch of the grand dispersion—that they constitute one of the original varieties which have existed ever since—that they are presumptively of the *Hamite* family, and are now experiencing the effects of the divine denunciation uttered by Noah against their wicked progenitor.

Their high antiquity cannot be doubted or disputed, unless a similar race can be found in the other hemisphere, from which they might have been derived at a

more recent date. Their savage character and condition can be as easily accounted for as the degeneracy of their kindred in Africa or of any other portion of the human family. No people, *known in history* to have been civilized, have ever become absolute savages *in their own country*; though many have sunk into the lowest depths of ignorance and wretchedness; the modern Egyptians, Syrians, Arabs, Greeks, for example. Still none of these are savages. The savage state preceded all history except the Bible; but it did not precede civilization. That Noah and his immediate descendants were civilized—that their posterity, who never removed from the fatherland or who settled in the countries adjacent, were civilized, and have continued to be civilized to this day, though degraded in all respects—is attested by Scripture, by history, and by all observation. It was the unfortunate destiny of the colonists who wandered far, and in small companies, and in destitute circumstances, and who were suddenly cut off from all intercourse with their home and with their brethren, to become savages. It was one of the first and most disastrous results of the dispersion of mankind, and a part of the punishment inflicted, we may presume, on the most guilty among the numerous transgressors who provoked the divine displeasure. And if the principal or greatest sufferers in this respect were children of Ham, may we not still witness the literal fulfilment of the patriarchal malediction throughout America, as well as in Africa.

Whatever indications exist or may yet be discovered of a former civilization, I repeat, can have no connexion

with the aborigines. They are to be regarded as the work of a different and superior race—of temporary occupants, it may be, or of trading adventurers—or, at most, of merely local settlers, who never extended their influence or conquests over the wide land. The Phœnicians were a trading, not a conquering people. They built cities, at various distant ports, for commercial purposes; and they would have pursued the same policy in Mexico and Peru, had they ever learned the way to those golden regions. The Chinese and Hindus, probably, would have acted in the same fashion. But let the facts be first ascertained, and then probably there will be less scope for conjecture and castle-building.

RELIGIOUS PREJUDICES.

RELIGIOUS PREJUDICES.

SIR WILLIAM JONES, at the commencement of an essay, in which he proposes to draw a parallel between the gods of the Indian and European heathens, makes the following liberal preliminary remark: "I shall remember that nothing is less favourable to inquiries after truth than a systematical spirit: and shall call to mind the saying of a Hindu writer, 'that whoever obstinately adheres to any set of opinions may bring himself to believe that the freshest sandal wood is a flame of fire.'"

To rise above vulgar prejudices, is generally esteemed an evidence of an enlightened and superior mind. If by this, nothing more were meant, than a rejection of error for the sake of truth, or an honest disposition to seek and to embrace truth to the utter renunciation of error, in defiance of all our previous opinions and habits, we should not object to the position. Such a determination, if rigidly adhered to, does certainly evince much candour of temper and strength of intellect. But if the declaimers against vulgar prejudices expect us to be divested of every prejudice before we can be qualified for the fair investigation of truth or for its reception, we humbly conceive that they quite overshoot the mark, by making a demand on poor human nature which it neither can nor ought to yield. All men have prejudices. They

imbibe them unconsciously and imperceptibly from the first moments in which impressions are made on the senses from any causes.

Prejudice is a prejudgment—or a judgment formed beforehand, without examination—an anticipation of knowledge—a preconceived opinion—or an opinion embraced without proof, or, at least, before the mind has ever comprehended the proof which supports it.

The majority of every man's sentiments and principles may, with much propriety, be denominated prejudices. He has received them from his parents, from his nurse, from his teachers, from his associates, from accidental circumstances, from the peculiarity of his position and rank in society, from the particular form of government and religion of his country, from partial reading, and from all those numerous and nameless causes and influences which give variety to life, and which impart a specific colouring to every man's character and destiny. Many of these prejudices are doubtless good and well-founded, though we may never trouble ourselves at all about the foundation on which they rest. The mass of mankind, in every country, are actuated and governed by their prejudices. They neither reflect nor reason for themselves. If their prejudices happen to be correct, they generally prove orderly and useful citizens or subjects. And we certainly feel no desire to interrupt the tranquillity of such virtuous well-meaning persons, by suggesting a single doubt, or by throwing a single difficulty in their way. Let them live and die under the salutary influence of prejudice. Let the Laplander love

his freezing snows, and the African his burning sun. It is a happy prejudice which inclines him to prefer his dreary native regions to every other country. Were it not for this prejudice, this invincible *amor patriæ*, half the globe would be destitute of inhabitants. It is therefore an innocent and very beneficial prejudice. This is one instance. Many more of a similar kind might be mentioned. Happy would it be for the human family were all their prejudices equally harmless. Happy if their prejudices on subjects of deep and lasting moment were always in favour of truth.

But the fact is far otherwise. The ten thousand totally dissimilar and contradictory political and religious systems which prevail in the world, and which command the affections of men, incontestably prove that the prejudices of the far greater proportion of our race are erroneous. These prejudices, too, are inveterate. It is scarcely possible to eradicate them from the minds of any considerable number. And it is always dangerous to attack the prejudices of the multitude in an open and direct manner. Such an attack generally tends to bind them more strongly to their errors: or if it should produce an opposite effect, the consequences are oftentimes much more deplorable. This is eminently the case with regard to religious prejudices. The falsest views and notions of religion are better than none. Without the fear of God, in some form, operating on the mind and conscience of men, human laws become nugatory, and society is at an end. Witness France—so often cited on similar occasions—soon after the commencement of

her revolutionary tumults. Her ignorant volatile people were so powerfully wrought upon by the disguised enemies of truth, that they were at length induced to trample in the dust the entire fabric which papal tyranny and superstition had erected among them, to burst in sunder the chains by which they had been for ages fettered, and to rush into all the extravagancies of atheistic licentiousness. No substitute was offered them for the absurdities of a religion which they so hastily abandoned. The result was natural, and might have been anticipated. Every benevolent oppugner of popular religious prejudice will proceed with cautious steps; and endeavour to give at least an equivalent—something true and salutary—for what is false and mischievous. Otherwise he had better be content to let prejudice reign undisturbed.

These hasty and desultory remarks we have thought proper to premise as illustrative of the subject generally. We profess not, however, to be the advocates of prejudice any further than the welfare of society and the frailty of our nature seem to render unavoidable. The ignorant multitude are, and necessarily must be, under its dominion. Let them therefore be excused, and pass without censure or rebuke.

But can we extend the same indulgence to men who claim the distinction of scholars—of free inquirers after truth—who, notwithstanding their superior opportunities, and their high pretensions to science and liberality, do yet entertain partial and bigoted sentiments on any subject which they profess to have investigated, and which they certainly might have investigated to its very

foundations and throughout all its bearings and connexions? Is it not the prerogative of science to dispel error, to remove prejudice or to convert what was once prejudice, into certain knowledge or indisputable truth, by a lucid development of the evidence on which it rests? But when she fails to produce this effect in her votaries—when even the comparatively enlightened favoured few, who affect to despise the ignoble vulgar, evince an uncandid, dogmatical, opinionative spirit, an obstinate adherence to tenets which they have adopted, they cannot tell whence or wherefore—what can be reasonably urged in their defence or justification? Or what benefit do they derive from science, if their minds be not sufficiently enlarged and liberalized to qualify and dispose them to look into their own hearts, and to scrutinize the opinions and doctrines which they may have been accustomed to cherish as indubitable or as innate verities?

We do not mean to insinuate that a man, in order to become truly learned upon any subject, ought forthwith to renounce all his previously acquired ideas of that subject—to become, as it were, a *tabula rasa*—that he may be enabled to proceed dispassionately and without bias, till he shall arrive at truth by fair demonstration or induction. We would not reduce him to a state of infancy with a view to rectify the obliquities of premature manhood. This would be impossible. But we ask him to exercise his reason in subjecting to a legitimate test the materials already stored in his mind. We ask him to be ready to give the proof of what he professes to believe; and not like mere children to appeal to the authority of

parents and teachers, or like orthodox Romanists, who believe because the church believes. We ask him to venture beyond the bare *ipse dixit* of philosopher or priest or favourite author, and to learn why his master has taught him thus, or why this particular creed or system has been imposed on his mind and incorporated with his feelings rather than another. We ask him, in a word, to be open to conviction. Not to become a skeptic in order to escape delusion.

When a man has once reached this point, he is in a fair way to discover truth and cordially to embrace it. He may then be said to have begun to be divested of prejudice. He is prepared to canvass systems and opinions which had once been his aversion; to give a candid hearing to men and parties which all his early habits and notions had led him to oppose and despise. Names no longer alarm him, however odious they may be to the particular party or sect or denomination with which birth and education may have connected him. It is truth, under whatever guise or name she appears, that he is now in search of. Such a man is liberal, forbearing, tolerant, generous, independent, just and modest. He never condemns hastily, nor without adequate cause. And if his researches shall have made him acquainted with the Bible—as they necessarily would, if he have the happiness to live in a Protestant Christian country—we may then behold in him an edifying example of what is so rarely to be met with—a truly charitable man. In the Bible he finds truth, pure and unadulterated, substantial and cheering to the soul. Before its

celestial light, all his religious prejudices vanish away. And his faith is settled, as upon a rock, never more to be shaken.

But why then are not all Christians of one mind and of one faith? Why do they not, at least, live together in the exercise of love and mutual forbearance? If charity be the essential pervading attribute of our holy religion; should we not expect that her friends would be friends to one another? Should we not expect, moreover, that much unanimity of sentiment would obtain among men who derive their notions or doctrines from one and the same source? This, we think, might reasonably have been anticipated. For we certainly should never have conjectured, previously to a knowledge of the fact, that so many discordant opinions as are entertained in the Christian world, could ever have claimed a shadow of support from the great charter of a religion so pre-eminently gracious and benevolent in its nature and object. Strange that so many inconsistencies should exist in a book, the avowed design and tendency of which are so plain and obvious that even the most illiterate may readily understand and obey its precepts. Strange that the Holy Scriptures, the volume of inspiration, the only unerring guide to mortals through this world of darkness, sin and trial, the only revelation ever vouchsafed by the infinitely wise and good Jehovah to his creatures—strange, inconceivably strange, that the work of such a Being, and given for so great and so kind a purpose, could be fairly construed or even plausibly perverted so as to countenance the multiform, absurd,

pernicious and contradictory dogmas which have been ascribed to it or extorted from it.

We must believe that a revelation from God could not be justly obnoxious to such variety of constructions: otherwise we take from it all certainty and all value. Its grand paramount object must be something definite, unequivocal and explicit. If then the Bible does contain a revelation of the Divine will—and that it does, all the contending parties agree—it necessarily follows that its main scope and design must be clear and precise, and altogether above the misconception of any candid mind. But were we to judge of the gospel exclusively from the conduct and writings of very many Christian doctors and divines, we should be apt to conclude that it consisted of some antiquated collection of ambiguous, metaphorical, mysterious, oracular, enigmatical phrases and sentences—similar to the far-famed Sibylline verses—which had been purposely contrived or accidentally arranged, to bewilder and perplex the human intellect, and to defy all rational interpretation. And yet, we feel assured, that the gospel is light; and that, like its glorious Author, in it there is no darkness at all. It unfolds to us a system of morals and a plan of salvation, which, however depraved ingenuity may misrepresent or reckless impiety assail and asperse it, cannot fail to command the reverence, and to meet the wants and fears and hopes of the humble, the ingenuous and the devout.

It becomes then a matter of some curiosity at least, to inquire whence such various and conflicting opinions have arisen with respect to its doctrines and provisions;

and why these still continue to be held by honest and dishonest, learned and unlearned Christians, in every land where the light and privileges of the gospel are most abundantly diffused and enjoyed? Whence is it that the mild, benevolent, peace-speaking religion of Jesus has been, and still is, disgraced by the wranglings and disputes of those who are solemnly commanded by their common Lord to dwell together in unity and love, as the brethren of one family, and the servants of one Master? Neither the nature of this religion, nor the volume which records it, furnishes any solution of the difficulty. No reason can there be discovered for such uncharitable dissensions.

The truth is, that all these differences, and all the controversies which have agitated the Christian church, are chargeable, in some sense, to prejudice—to the study and influence of theological systems, composed by schoolmen or philosophers, or spiritual dogmatists, or zealous enthusiasts, or aspiring ecclesiastical demagogues, and addressed to the credulity of their disciples, either as a substitute for the Bible or as a complete exposition of its doctrines. Thus we have embodied, in the elaborate tomes of divinity designed for the training of the youthful minister, and in the numberless religious books, tracts and catechisms prepared expressly for the laity, all sorts of crude speculation, of ingenious sophistry, of mystic reveries, of monstrous hallucinations, of logical subtleties and metaphysical refinements, which either human reason, or passion, or fancy, or ambition, or wisdom, or folly or cunning, or hypocrisy, may have been able to achieve or to inculcate.

This heterogeneous mixture of human absurdities with Divine revelation, has caused, and still nourishes, that captious persecuting spirit which has reigned for ages in the church. The gospel had scarcely appeared in the world, when it began to be adulterated by human contrivances. Among the Jews, it received much of its colouring from the Mosaic law and those traditionary institutions to which they were obstinately attached. Nor even among these did Christianity exhibit one uniform hue, but was diversely shaded according to the peculiarities of the several sects which embraced it:— as Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes and Herodians.

The Greeks and Romans, also, very soon endeavoured to incorporate their favourite philosophy with the body of the gospel. The disciples of Pythagoras, of Zeno, of Epicurus, of Plato, of Aristotle, did not fail to discover some kind of resemblance between many of their maxims and those of the Messiah. And even where there evidently was none at all, pride and prejudice prompted them to fancy or create one. They had been long accustomed to yield implicit credence to the word of their masters; whose dogmas they frequently revered as eternal and immutable truths. They sought therefore to bend the gospel to suit their own preconceived opinions, instead of examining these before the light of revelation. The same observation may apply to the admirers of the Oriental philosophy, which gave rise to the Gnostic and Manichean heresies. And in every country where the gospel was preached, there flourished a system of opinions deeply rooted in the minds of all classes of men.

These, the gospel had to encounter: and it succeeded beyond all human probability—in a degree, indeed, which no human means could have effected. The banners of the cross were unfurled in every region perhaps of the habitable earth: and multitudes submitted unreservedly to its heavenly precepts. But many, however, and those generally of the most learned and ingenious, yielded only in part. They chose to form to themselves a mixed system—a compound of truth and error. So that, in a little space, the world presented as great a variety of Scripture glosses, or rather mongrel gospels, as there were schools of philosophy.

Some were led by comparisons instituted between Christ and the ancient sages, to treat them all with the same veneration and respect. Thus Alexander Severus paid divine honours indiscriminately to Christ and to Orpheus, to Apollonius, and the other philosophers and heroes whose names were famous in history or in fable.

Christianity therefore was constantly fluctuating and changing its aspect, according to the caprice, or genius, or learning of the great fathers and doctors who professed to teach it *ex cathedra* and agreeably to the most approved systems and authorities. They seem never to have thought of regulating their studies and researches by Scripture alone. To study theology, was to study a system constructed by some celebrated bishop or divine, who had devoted his days and nights to the dialectics of Aristotle or to the more captivating morality of Plato; and who, of course, had warped and perverted every gospel tenet to some kind of conformity to his own peculiar

and more rational theory. Thus we may perceive that the gospel was not the cause of the early divisions in the church; but that these resulted solely from human devices and prejudices and anti-scriptural systems.

And when we contemplate the rapid progress of error in the world—the innumerable forms which the gospel was made to assume—the bitter animosities and furious contests which arose about the most insignificant quibbles and conceits—the colleges of divinity converted into nurseries of mere logomachy,—where, instead of the gospel, youth were carefully disciplined to manage with adroitness the noisy artillery of the most contemptible logic and metaphysics that ever disgraced the seats of science and religion—we may then have some faint conception of the extravagant absurdities to which a blind devotion to human systems evidently conducted nearly the whole Christian world antecedently to the Reformation.

The seminaries of learning in the middle ages, were constantly thronged with champions who eagerly sought distinction by entering the lists of public disputation; who were fired with ambitious zeal to vanquish an opponent in some notable controversy, which was oftentimes unimportant in its very nature—ambiguous in its terms—a mere play upon words—or, at best, a matter of perfect indifference whether decided in one way or another, or in no way at all. It is almost incredible that these scholastic sophists could have excited so much interest as is everywhere assigned to them in history. That men of the first-rate talents and acquirements should

sacrifice their time, health and comfort for the despicable pleasure of clearing up difficulties which never existed but in their own brain—of reconciling contradictions by renouncing common sense—establishing axioms by rigorous demonstration, and thereby obscuring the simplest truths, and which every tyro comprehends and believes the moment he hears them announced—is, indeed, a severe and most humiliating satire upon poor arrogant human nature. Scripture, reason, conscience, were all rejected. And the venerable, sagacious, infallible successors of St. Peter wisely ventured to rear their proud temple of superstition, power and grandeur, upon a much more convenient and stable basis.

Whenever a sanctimonious aspiring dignitary wished to introduce any innovations in faith or ritual—to strengthen his authority or augment his revenue—nothing more was necessary than to summon to his aid the subtle schoolmen and dependent clergy, who were so thoroughly practised in the manœuvres and evolutions of monkish tactics and ghostly warfare, as easily to convince or silence all gainsayers, and to induce the besotted multitude to swallow the most palpable contradictions, and to sanction the most flagrant immoralities. The people were powerfully prepossessed in favour of the Pope and of the holy mother church. So that any lesson or mandate from such a source was generally received without the least question or scruple. Thus the gigantic greatness of this tremendous anti-Christian hierarchy grew out of the early and gradual and steadily increasing admixture of human philosophy and inventions with

Divine truth, and from the final triumph of the former over the latter. Such an example, and such a result, may well incline us to distrust all systems which would either supersede the diligent study of Scripture, or which would preclude or control the free exercise of our reason in its interpretation.

Have we then amongst us none of that crafty, arrogant, secular, arbitrary, inquisitorial, furious, vindictive, system-building, church-glorifying spirit which characterized the darker ages of Romish fanaticism and usurpation? That there are numerous sects—all recognizing the same gospel—each believing the others wrong—each pertinaciously adhering to its own peculiarities—each regarding the rest with a suspicious and evil eye—and all striving for the mastery in some fashion or other—will hardly be denied. Nay, we know that the most illiberal and exasperating contests frequently arise among members of the same Christian denomination. And to what cause shall we, at the present day, impute the existence of misunderstandings and dissensions, which, viewed through the glass of history, appear so strange, so puerile, so utterly inconsistent with every Christian grace, and with every principle of enlightened policy or of ordinary decorum; especially now, that the light of the Reformation, the invention of printing, the vast increase of knowledge, have dissipated so many errors, and paved the way for the detection of them all? We are constrained to attribute these, as similar effects, to the same cause. Instead of going directly to Scripture, which alone ought to be our guide, we (*i.e.* the simple, honest,

credulous mass of both ministers and people,) imbibe our theological prejudices and tenets from human systems and expositions; or from the *dicta* of some living village or sectarian or metropolitan *de facto* pope. That is, we adopt our religion before we think of examining the only authentic record of its origin and character in existence.

There is something so preposterous in this mode of procedure that we cannot divine a semblance of excuse for pursuing it. Unless, indeed, we admit, what some assert, that there is danger of being led astray by too early an acquaintance with Scripture—that we ought previously to be well grounded in the doctrines of our faith, in order that we may be less exposed to a misconception of the sacred writers, and have something settled and fixed in our minds to serve as a standard of truth. As if Divine revelation were less perfect and less intelligible than human speculation! As if Divine revelation needed the wisdom or the ingenuity of man to illustrate its simplest principles, and to bring them down to a level with common capacities: when we know that the gospel was originally preached by Christ and his Apostles to the humblest and most illiterate of mankind!

By the latter remarks, we would not intimate that everything contained in the Bible can be understood by a mere perusal of the text,—far from it. There are mysteries—mysterious facts—which the most gifted and enlightened mind can never penetrate or unfold; and in examining which, the man of science has but little advantage over the unlettered peasant. There are many passages of a historic, prophetic, political and juridical

nature—many poetic and allegorical representations—many singular allusions and graphic descriptions—many sententious proverbs and significant parables—many references to local customs, arts and ceremonies—together with many embarrassing difficulties of a mythological, geographical, physiological, idiomatic and critical character—which require a most extensive and thorough knowledge of almost everything peculiar to the ancient world, including the languages also in which the whole was originally recorded. We would, by no means, therefore, seem to depreciate the necessity or value of real science and profound scholarship. The more sound learning we can acquire, the better. But away with the trashy figments of the scholastic ages, in whatever novel forms they may be served up and garnished to suit the modern taste of knave or fool. Away with the polemic dogmatism and metaphysical cant of conceited, intolerant, bigoted, theological dictators of every church and party. Genuine divinity is contained in the Scriptures alone: and there only can it be learned in all its primeval purity and perfection. Were we, therefore, with becoming diligence, humble docility and prayerful sincerity, to study the Bible, unbiased by prejudice or authority, we should seldom disagree in any matter of radical importance. The gracious Author of our religion never designed to veil it in clouds and darkness in order to conceal it from vulgar eyes.

Considering then the manifest simplicity of the gospel, and the singularly benevolent spirit which it breathes,

we might presume that the accredited ministers of Christ, who serve at his altar, who preach his cross and administer his ordinances, who devote their lives to the study and dispensation of his word, would be enabled to overcome all the difficulties which might occasion some slight discrepancies of opinion among men of ordinary opportunities and pursuits:—or, at least, that they would cordially harmonize in all essential points: while in regard to those of minor moment, the mere circumstantials of religion, they would charitably agree to differ. Why should not every honest Christian divine be disposed to address his brother in the language of Wesley? “Is thy heart right with God? If it be, give me thy hand. I do not mean, ‘be of my opinion.’ You need not. Neither do I mean, ‘I will be of your opinion.’ I cannot. Let all opinions alone; only give me thine hand.” Why not be as teachable as Locke? “I read the word of God without prepossession or bias, and come to it with a resolution to take my sense from it, and not with a design to bring it to the sense of my system.” Or as catholic as Robert Hall? “No man, or set of men, are entitled to prescribe as an indispensable condition of communion, what the New Testament has not enjoined as a condition of salvation.”

But notwithstanding the reasonableness of this expectation, many of the clergy, even Protestant clergy, have betrayed more illiberality and bitterness in their conduct and publications than almost any other class of men in society. Their *odium theologicum* has become a prover-

bial and standing reproach. Their prejudices seem to be invincible, and their animosities inveterate.* And yet,

1. In the first place: They have no solid reason for differing at all; as must appear from the whole tenor of our argument and illustrations.

2. In the second place: The greater part of them do not differ in matters of much importance: or the difference is rather verbal than real.

3. In the third place: Common sense ought to teach them the folly of contending for points that are scarcely perceptible; for quibbles in language which a grammarian

* Witness the melancholy and embittered contests between Luther and Calvin; which kept them as wide asunder, in heart or affection at least, as both were distant from their common adversary, the Pope. Witness the two hundred years' war between the Calvinists and Arminians about *five points*,—which some shrewd men have suspected, no doubt rashly or profanely, to be after all incomprehensible in their very nature, and therefore inexplicable, and therefore undebatable. Witness the fierce gladiatorial combats of Episcopacy and Presbytery—of both with Independency or Congregationalism—of High Church and Low Church in all sects—of ultra orthodox and all sorts of self-styled moderate or liberal or peace men in every denomination. Witness the uncompromising and endless disputes about the mode and subjects of Baptism—about the particular day to be hallowed as the Christian Sabbath—about the nature and extent of the atonement—about original sin, free will, Divine agency, the proper office of the Holy Spirit in the work of conversion, etc., etc. Witness the deplorable divisions, the domestic feuds and family broils, which rend and distract the American churches of almost every name, at this day, under divers forms and pretexts. Indeed, the entire history of Protestant Christendom is replete with instances which corroborate all our positions, and amply demonstrate the folly and danger of confiding in human wisdom or authority to the neglect of the heavenly Teacher. Verily, “it is easier (as a profound thinker has declared) to lead a hundred thousand men to battle than to vanquish a single prejudice.”

would disdain to notice; for shades of distinction which no unjaundiced eye could ever trace; for punctilios of ceremony and discipline which are perfectly discretionary, which may be managed twenty ways equally well, or which may be omitted altogether; for modes of treating and expounding mysteries which are infinitely above our reach, and with which the Author of the gospel never intended that we should intermeddle further than he has revealed.

4. In the fourth place: Experience proves the impolicy and absurdity of conducting any controversies in that acrimonious abusive style which generally predominates in religious warfare. When deep-rooted prejudices encounter each other, reason invariably retires from the field of battle. And the rival disputants frequently give full license to all their powers of satire, ridicule, invective and low scurrility; without once recollecting that their professed object was only to convince and reclaim a wandering brother. A discourteous, arrogant, overbearing mode of dealing with adversaries or errorists never did, and never will make a sincere convert. Its tendency is rather to confirm men in prejudice and error—to harden and exasperate and embitter the heart. More injury has probably been done to the cause of Christ by such narrow-minded impracticable bigots, than by the whole tribe of infidels and avowed opposers of the gospel since its first introduction into the world.

5. In the fifth place: The Scriptures of eternal truth condemn, in most decisive terms, this whole system or method of “contending earnestly for the faith once de-

livered to the saints," by the dexterous employment of mere carnal weapons, furnished by an ambitious church or school or party champion. Charity is inscribed, as with a sunbeam, upon every page of this blessed volume. We are directed to bear with each other's infirmities; to "avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law, for they are unprofitable and vain." "If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself." "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called; which some professing, have erred concerning the faith." "Flee also youthful lusts: but follow righteousness, faith, charity, peace, with them that call on the Lord out of a pure heart. But foolish and unlearned questions avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes. And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient; in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." "It is (remarks Dr. Campbell) the liberal advice of an apostle: 'Prove all things, hold fast that which is good;'—an advice which breathes nothing of that narrow, sectarian spirit, which has sc

long and so generally prevailed among Christians of all denominations, and hath proved the greatest pest of the cause." "It is indeed shocking (says Toplady, whose own practice, by-the-way, did not always accord with his precept,) that those who profess to experience and to preach the love of Christ, can so far prostitute the dignity and the design of their sacred calling, as to seek to exasperate differing parties against each other, instead of labouring to preserve unity of spirit, to strengthen the bond of peace, and to promote righteousness of life."

Many persons, no doubt, reject and denounce the gospel without examination, because its rash, obstinate, official advocates betray the cause by their mutual persecutions and recriminations. They will judge of its excellence by [what they mistake for] its effects upon the lives of its teachers. They despise, and with reason, the contentious, intolerant, uncompromising spirit which reigns among them. They perceive also the utter want of worldly prudence and judicious tact in all such conduct. "The true secret (says Hume) for the discreet management of sectarists, is to tolerate them." When unopposed, their strength is spent in the air, and they die of themselves. In this sentiment, the shrewd philosophical skeptic is supported by the learned commentator on the Laws of England. "Undoubtedly (observes Judge Blackstone) all persecution and oppression of weak consciences, on the score of religious persuasion, are highly unjustifiable upon every principle of natural reason, civil liberty or sound religion." Man is *naturally* accountable

to no tribunal for the soundness of his faith and the purity of his worship, but to that only which can search the heart. "To banish, imprison, plunder, starve, hang and burn men for religion, (says Jortin,) is not the gospel of Christ; it is the gospel of the devil. Where persecution begins, Christianity ends. Christ never used anything that looked like force or violence except once: and that was to drive bad men out of the temple, and not to drive them in."

Now we fain would know in what persecution essentially consists. In this enlightened age, it is generally conceded that men ought to be allowed to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences; that no laws ought to be enacted, tending in the least to endanger liberty, life or property, on the ground of religious belief or profession. But can men be injured, persecuted and oppressed only in personal liberty, life or property? Is it no persecution to sport with the feelings of men?—to cavil against, condemn and ridicule principles and ceremonies which they regard most sacred? Is it no persecution to denounce the members of a dissenting sect or individuals of our own sect whose *shibboleth* we cannot or will not enunciate, as deluded fanatics or obdurate heretics—as crafty designing hypocrites—as wilful and impudent perverters of gospel language and doctrines—as ambitious conformists to the corrupt maxims of the world—as morose churlish devotees, who would deprive us of every rational enjoyment—or as ravenous wolves in sheep's clothing? Is it no persecution to hold men up before the public as objects of scorn and derision—as

insidious corrupters of the popular morals, whose society ought, above all things, to be avoided?—to set a mark of disgrace upon them, which must render their name odious to all but their own particular communion or party? In a word, to wound their character in the tenderest points; to destroy their comfort, as far as possible, in this world, and to consign them to perdition in the next? If this be not persecution, and of no very gentle character too, then the term to us has no meaning and no application. “The apostle indeed forewarned the early converts that there must be heresies in the church, that they who are approved may be made manifest: but it does not occur to these fiery zealots, that a system of persecution for opinion is the worst of all heresies, as it violates at once truth and charity.”

But while we thus appear the advocate of charity in opposition to sectarian bigotry, which always results from prejudice of some kind, we would not forget that even bigots and persecutors have a claim upon our charity. They, too, are not unfrequently rather to be commiserated than harshly condemned. St. Paul, when hurried onward by his prejudices—by zeal without knowledge—to the most revolting acts of cruelty and violence upon the harmless unresisting followers of Christ, was an object of pity rather than of hatred. He was honest, though misguided. His ignorance however could not excuse him, because it was voluntary. He had the means of being better informed. But his bigoted attachment to the system in which he had been educated, shut the door to inquiry and to light. And,

without a miracle, he probably would never have seen his errors.

Many examples might be cited to illustrate the difficulty with which men are emancipated from the trammels of prejudice; and our obligations to exercise much tenderness and forbearance towards them. “My own case (says Luther, in a description of his feelings respecting the matters in dispute between Eckius and himself,) is a notable example of the difficulty with which a man emerges from erroneous notions of long standing. How true is the proverb: ‘custom is a second nature.’ How true is that saying of Augustin: ‘habit, if not resisted, becomes necessity.’ I who, both publicly and privately, had taught divinity with the greatest diligence for seven years, insomuch that I retained in my memory almost every word of my lectures, was, in fact, at that time only just initiated into the knowledge and faith of Christ: I had only just learned that a man must be justified and saved, not by works, but by the faith of Christ: and lastly, in regard to pontifical authority, though I publicly maintained that the Pope was not the head of the church by a *Divine right*, yet I stumbled at the very next step, namely, that the whole Papal system was a satanic invention. This I did not see, but contended obstinately for the Pope’s *right*, founded on *human reasons*: so thoroughly deluded was I, by the example of others, by the title of *Holy Church*, and by my own habits. Hence I have learned to have more candour for bigoted Papists, especially if they are not much acquainted with sacred, or perhaps even with profane history.” “In the schools

(he observes again) I lost Jesus Christ: I have now found him in St. Paul."

But even this enlightened reformer and indefatigable inquirer after truth, fell at last far short of a complete victory over the prejudices of the age in which he lived, and in which he had been nurtured. His doctrine of consubstantiation, for instance, is regarded by a large majority of Protestant Christians as not a whit less unscriptural and contradictory than that of transubstantiation which he reprobated. "Truth is seldom seen at once in its full order and proportion of parts." And "strong conviction is much more apt to breed strife in matters of little moment than in subjects of high importance."

Scott, in his *Force of Truth*, has exhibited his own experience on this subject. His case was somewhat peculiar, and certainly very unpromising. He seemed "lost in error's endless maze." His slow progress, step by step, with much study and research; reluctantly yielding up, inch after inch, the ground which he had already assumed, and which he seemed resolved, at all hazards, to maintain; and his final surrender of the whole before the broad daylight and omnipotence of truth; may serve to expose the despotic power of prejudice, and to point out the proper way to overcome and subdue it.*

* Widely different was the procedure of Dr. Priestley, and widely different also was the result: as the following paragraph from a Quarterly Reviewer of 1812, may show. The *rationale* here given is characteristic and illustrative of the course pursued by many a superior mind in similar circumstances. It is not uncommon for a man to be great and liberal and just in one department of scientific investigation,

“The authors of all systems (says a judicious divine) are more or less prejudiced in behalf of some particular and artificial mode of faith. He, therefore, who begins with the study of them, and afterwards proceeds to the sacred volume, sees with a jaundiced eye every text supporting the peculiar tenets of his first master, and acts as absurd a part as he who tries not the gold by the copal, but the copal by the gold. The principles of real

while he is quite the reverse in another. There have been but few Ciceros and Bacons and Lockes and Newtons even among the *nomina clara* of philosophy.

“In his theological and philosophical pursuits, he (Priestley) seemed to be compounded of two different men. It was not to his penetrating genius only that mankind are indebted for his vast discoveries in chemistry, but to a spirit of investigation exact and persevering in this department—proceeding by cautious induction which allowed much slower understandings to keep pace with his own, and guarding against error in his conclusions by frequent repetition of his experiments. It is not a little remarkable, however, that in his theological pursuits, and more especially in those of ecclesiastical history, in which he most disgracefully failed, the conduct of his understanding was precisely reversed. He began with conclusions, and then sought for premises to justify them. Having previously made up his mind that certain doctrines could not have come from God, he proceeded by a species of analysis peculiar to himself, to demonstrate that they were not contained in Scripture. To this end the analogies of language were set aside, grammar tortured, and rules of lax interpretation applied to the most decisive and convincing texts, by which anything might be deduced from anything. Above all, mystery was to be discarded, and the philosopher, who knew and acknowledged that the most common operations of nature quickly ran up into causes and principles, which eluded even his own penetrating research; when he assumed the character of the theologian, and undertook to investigate subjects which are in no degree the objects of sense, would not endure that the Almighty should ‘veil himself in clouds,’ and that ‘darkness should be the habitation of his seat.’”

theology are to be found only in the word and works of God: and he who would extract them pure and unsophisticated, must dig for them himself in that exhaustless mine."

But should it be objected, that if we were to discard all human auxiliaries and authorities, and to search the Scriptures alone with attention and candour, still there would be no unity in doctrine; we answer in the words of Chillingworth: "1. It is impossible you should know this, considering that there are many places in Scripture which do more than probably import, that the want of piety in living is the cause of want of unity in believing. 2. That there would be unity of opinion in all things necessary, and that in things not necessary, unity of opinion is not necessary. 3. But lastly, that notwithstanding differences in these things of lesser importance, there might and would be unity of communion, unity of charity and affection, which is one of the greatest blessings which the world is capable of; absolute unity of opinion being a matter rather to be desired than hoped for." Such catholic sentiments in the reign of the first Charles are worthy of all praise.*

* We do not recollect ever to have conversed with an individual, whether of the clergy or laity, who did not claim to be exempt from all prejudice and uncharitableness. The truth is, most men deceive themselves in this matter. They are charitable on a grand scale—towards the heathen, it may be—and all the world, afar off. But at home—towards their nearest brethren of another party name—they indulge the temper and feelings of a *Dominic* or a *Bonner*. Thus, a loyal churchman, contemporary with Chillingworth, in a letter to a friend, the chief scope of which would seem to be the exhibition of

We are aware that the tenor of this whole discussion is directly opposed to the popular voice on the subject. It is generally esteemed an evidence of a strong, original, independent mind to have settled or firmly established opinions at an early period:—a mark of intellectual superiority and moral courage never to doubt, or waver, or change, when once we have adopted our opinions;—a point of honour to sustain and defend them on all occasions and at all hazards. And this, too, notwithstanding they may oftentimes have been embraced upon the most flimsy grounds, or without any reason whatever. Such a person has effectually closed every door and avenue to the acquisition of knowledge. He has eyes, but he sees not; ears, but he hears not; understanding, but he perceives not. He moves in a charmed circle. He cannot get out of it, or look beyond it. He is a one-sided, wrong-headed, self-sufficient politician or religionist as long as he lives. Now, an opinionated man—especially a young man who is just entering upon the threshold of liberal inquiry—and, above all, one who is commencing a course of theological study with a view to the sacred ministry—is, at best, but a sorry specimen of adventurous

himself as a paragon of Christian charity, after sundry honeyed phrases, adds, with infinite *naïveté*, the following precious proof: “Difference in opinion may work a disaffection in me, but not a detestation; I rather pity than hate Turk or Infidel, for they are of the same metal, and bear the same stamp as I do, though the inscriptions differ. If I hate any, it is those schismatics that puzzle the sweet peace of our church; so that I could be content to see an Anabaptist go to hell on a Brownist’s back.” (*Letter of James Howell, Esq., to Sir Ed. B. Knight.*)

blindfold humanity. We cannot but regard him as a vain deluded creature, who is about to impose on himself a tedious painful drudgery, through which we foresee he will doggedly worry, without the slightest prospect of ever becoming one jot the wiser. He has prejudged the cause, and is fully resolved never to alter one article or clause of his creed. Nay, this creed may have been prescribed to him by authority at the outset: and he may have been required to bind himself by promise or oath never to believe, think, act or teach, except in conformity with its arbitrary instructions. Yet, however much we may commiserate the weakness or folly or rashness or hardihood of such an individual, or however much we may dread and deplore the consequences likely to result from his future influence as a spiritual guide or ecclesiastical dignitary, he will be lauded and honoured by his party as a bold, consistent, high-minded, unflinching advocate of orthodoxy. But is there honesty—is there independence—is there magnanimity in such a course, or in the mind that can be constrained to pursue it? “The dogmatist (says Campbell) knows nothing of degrees, either in evidence or in faith. He has properly no opinions or doubts. Everything with him is either certainly true or certainly false. Of this turn of mind I shall only say, that far from being an indication of vigour, it is a sure indication of debility in the intellectual powers.” “In all cases (remarks Beattie) where dogmatical belief tends to harden the heart, or to breed prejudices incompatible with candour, humanity and the

love of truth, all good men will be careful to cultivate moderation and diffidence.”*

How often do we see men who have heard or perused only one side of a furious controversy, declare themselves

* We have not designed, in this rambling essay, to approach the question about the necessity or the expediency of creeds, confessions and articles of religion. It will be time enough to reject them, when experience shall have proved it practicable for any church to exist without them. We merely hold, that the public teacher of Christianity ought to be thoroughly conversant with Scripture in order to be qualified to subscribe honestly to any creed or formulary. When he has thus voluntarily and conscientiously subscribed, he is of course bound to preach accordingly. He cannot, in good faith, adhere ostensibly to any church or ecclesiastical connexion, while opposed to its doctrines or government. It is his duty to leave such connexion whenever he finds it irksome, oppressive or criminal to comply with its known and acknowledged requisitions, or to fulfil his own promises and engagements.

As to children, and the mass of the people, they must ever be, in a large measure, dependent on parental and ministerial instructions. So much the greater is the urgency for a well educated, faithful, devoted ministry, to give the proper tone and character to every gradation of inferior and subordinate teachers. Nor do we object to the use of theological systems, commentaries, etc., provided they be rigidly tried and judged by the “law and the testimony,” and not implicitly followed as paramount and infallible guides. But, the Bible first, above all, without rival or peer, always open and in hand, constantly studied “without note or comment,” and with the single purpose of arriving at the “mind of the Spirit” in the language of the Spirit.

The answer of Luther to his friend George Spalatinus, on being requested to give him his advice concerning the best method of acquiring sacred knowledge, deserves to be remembered and practised by every student in divinity. After recommending to his notice certain parts of the writings of Jerome, Ambrose and Augustin, he exhorts him always to begin his studies with *serious prayer*: for, says he, “there is really no interpreter of the Divine word, but its own Author.” He adds: “Read the Bible in order from the beginning to the end.”

perfectly convinced, and unalterably fixed in their opinions? They act like an ignorant jury, whose passions are excited and whose judgments are thereby swayed or bribed to assent to any measure or award which a skilful advocate may urge in behalf of his client: and who would, if then called upon for a decision, undoubtedly find an unrighteous verdict. They would decide under the influence of passion, prejudice and partial information. Such injustice or iniquity, however, is generally prevented by their being compelled to hear counsel for the defendant also. They therefore gradually become cool and self-possessed while listening, it may be, to a clear, simple, judicious, matter-of-fact argument or statement from the opposite party: or, if their passions shall be again appealed to, the two directly contrary fires will destroy or neutralize each other's effects, and leave them once more in the exercise of reason and common sense. We ought, then, in all our pursuits after truth, particularly when sought amidst the flames of controversy, to be "persuaded that moments of passion are always moments of delusion; that nothing truly is what it then seems to be; that all the opinions which we then form, are erroneous; and all the judgments which we pass, are extravagant." (*Blair.*)

A single notorious fact might lead us, without further inquiry, to suspect the dangerous tendency of theological systems, devised to regulate and control human reason. It is this: We universally find that, at least, ninety-nine hundredths of mankind, learned and unlearned, live and

die fully persuaded of the truth and excellence of the doctrines and ceremonies of that particular sect to which they happen to belong by birth. The evil of instilling party prejudices and opinions into the youthful mind must therefore be conceded: or we must allow that the creeds of Papist and Protestant, of Socinian and Athanasian, are equally good and true. Nay, by the same rule, we ought to apologize for the Jew, the Mohammedan and the Pagan. For these, too, believe as they have been taught. Such is human nature: whatever men may have imbibed from early childhood with implicit confidence, they inflexibly retain and cherish—especially everything of a sacred nature. A kind of superstitious veneration, a solemn dread of indulging what might be accounted an impious curiosity, ordinarily prevents all future investigation, and confirms them in the faith of their fathers. Now, what argument can be plausibly advanced *a priori* for preferring the system of one sect to that of another? How ought an unbiased individual, (if one there be,) still ignorant of Christianity but desirous to become acquainted with its principles, to choose among them? How would you advise him to proceed? Would you direct him to this or that sectarian system or confession, and assure him of its entire agreement with the Scriptures? But, suppose he should ask, Does not every sect possess a system or profess a creed founded, in like manner, exclusively upon the same Scriptures? Do they not all affirm that the word of God—the Bible—is the only authentic and unerring criterion by which

to distinguish truth from falsehood? And do they not all loudly proclaim their ability to establish by it every tittle of their doctrine and church polity? He would be exceedingly perplexed, and utterly at a loss to know where to begin or what course to pursue, unless his own good sense would suggest to him the obvious propriety of neglecting them all for the present, and of recurring at once to the sacred paramount standard which all receive as infallible and reverence as divine.

Finally: What is there so captivating or magical or potent in a mere name, that we should suffer ourselves to be duped or dazzled by it or subjected to its dominion? It can neither protect us from error and mischief, nor guide us in the sure road to heavenly peace and happiness. Why do we not then study the gospel of Jesus Christ, rather than the gospel of Luther, or Calvin, or Hopkins, or Wesley? Why do we not, in this respect, heed the injunction of the Apostle to the primitive converts, not to account themselves the disciples of Paul or Apollos or Cephas or of any other human teacher or master, however eminent or gifted? And why, when we pretend to take the Scriptures as our only authority, do we dread a sentiment or doctrine or truth evidently set forth therein merely because it may be in favour with an unpopular or dissenting party? Why do we hesitate to welcome truth, even though a heretic or infidel may have stumbled upon it? If, indeed, we ever become earnest, dispassionate, persevering seekers after truth, we shall inevitably subscribe to many things which have

been admitted by all the belligerent Christian sects—not because they admit them, but because the Bible clearly reveals them. We shall retain much that is common to all. We shall not be Calvinists perhaps, nor Arminians. We shall have become the honest followers of Jesus Christ and of him only. If so, we shall be ready to extend our charity to all his sincere disciples, by whatever appellation they may be known among men. We shall estimate Christian sincerity by the life and practice, rather than by the profession. We shall learn to judge by the fruits, and not by the peculiarities of a creed. Let us then dare to make the gospel the only basis of our faith, and the only rule of our conduct. And we may calmly bid defiance to the slanders and reproaches of an illiberal, bigoted, misjudging, captious world.

If we know our own hearts, (the faithful pastors should be able to say,) we fain would be divested of all sectarian and of all secular pride and prejudice. We would preach to guilty perishing sinners neither this nor that distinguished divine or reformer. We would preach Jesus Christ and him crucified. We would acknowledge ourselves his servants and his only. We would glory in his cross, and in being esteemed his ambassadors and ministers; and as such, we should feel ourselves invested with an official character and authority infinitely above what any man or ecclesiastical body can impart.

Should we then ascend to the fountain head, and no

longer be contented with the shallow and turbid streams, which are flowing in every direction from spurious or poisoned sources, wonderful and glorious would be the effects. How soon would petty distinctions vanish away — party animosities cease — and Christians everywhere be disposed to banish envy, malice, pride and bigotry! “Universal charity would throw wide her arms, and humility stoop to the tenderest offices of beneficence. Dove-like meekness would smile with benignity in her heart and candour upon her lips.” “Blessed are the peace-makers: for they shall be called the children of God.”

AN ADDRESS ON THE OCCASION OF THE CENTENNIAL
BIRTHDAY OF GEORGE WASHINGTON.

[NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, FEBRUARY 22, 1832.]

AN ADDRESS ON THE OCCASION OF THE CENTENNIAL
BIRTHDAY OF GEORGE WASHINGTON.*

A CENTURY has now elapsed since the birth of our immortal Washington, and ten millions of freemen can this day testify that a republic is not always ungrateful to her noblest benefactor. With what thrilling emotions have we not listened again to his last paternal counsels, and yielded the conviction of honest hearts to the truth and wisdom of all his sagacious and ever seasonable instructions! Such a farewell address was worthy of the

* Delivered at Nashville, Tennessee, February 22d, 1832, immediately after the reading of the Farewell Address. On the sixth instant, the author was requested by a Committee of Arrangements, in behalf of the citizens of Nashville and its vicinity, to prepare an address for the approaching celebration of the Centennial Birthday of George Washington. He at first declined, on account of his numerous official engagements, and because he wished the duty to be assigned to a more suitable and competent individual. When assured, however, that no other person could be prevailed on to officiate, he reluctantly consented (*viz.* on the eighth) to make the attempt—without the least hope of fulfilling even the most moderate expectations which such an occasion was calculated to excite. He was, moreover, afflicted with severe and painful indisposition, which rendered it impossible for him to study or write, during a greater part of the interval. On the evening of the twenty-second he was earnestly solicited by the Committee to furnish a copy of his Address for immediate publication. The rough notes, therefore, without alteration or addition, were sent to the printer; and on the twenty-fourth the Address appeared in the Nashville newspapers.

father of his country. It is itself an invaluable legacy to the latest generations—where liberty, integrity, the rights of man, the principles of universal equity, the calm pursuits of unambitious peaceful tranquillity, the steady progressive advancement of the human species in virtue, intelligence and happiness, shall be duly appreciated and honoured. Nor can a more appropriate tribute of respect be offered to his memory, than the solemn recital, in the ears of the people, on each returning anniversary of his birthday, of this precious valedictory. It is a text-book for our statesmen to study—and it may serve as an infallible test in the hands of the people, by which to try the spirit and character of their rulers and of all political aspirants. Let every youth commit it to memory. Let its maxims be engraven upon every American heart. It will enlighten his judgment, enlarge his conceptions, elevate and chasten his patriotism, subdue his sectional and selfish prejudices, expand his bosom with a generous philanthropy, and lead him to esteem all the citizens of every State as his brethren, and as equally entitled to all the franchises, privileges and blessings which our common constitution and representative government were designed to secure and to perpetuate.

Until the declaration of our national independence, on the Fourth of July, 1776, the history of England constituted part and parcel of our own history. And if Englishmen had anything to boast of in literature, in science, in arts, in arms, in religion, in government, prior to that period, the Anglo-Americans are fairly entitled to a participation in all her glory. Shakspeare and Milton,

Hampden and Sidney, Bacon and Boyle, Locke and Newton, Pope and Addison, Marlborough and Chatham, grace the pages of our ante-revolutionary annals, as do Washington, Franklin, La Fayette, Warren, Montgomery, Greene, Gates, Morris, Rutledge, Laurens, Hamilton, Adams, Jay, Jefferson, and a hundred others, those of the half century which has since passed away.

If Englishmen derived any substantial benefits from the sturdy resistance of their haughty barons against the despotic prerogatives of the crown—any additional immunities from *Magna Charta* extorted by force from an absolute and capricious monarch—any permanent alleviations from the furious convulsions of the civil wars under Charles and the Commonwealth—any constitutional guarantee for civil and personal rights from the glorious revolution which transferred the crown of three kingdoms from the Stuarts to William and Mary, and finally to the house of Hanover—then have we inherited and shared, to the fullest extent, all these mighty boons of English prowess and of English chivalry.

Here then is our vantage ground. Have we lost it—have we forfeited it—have we dishonoured the land of our sires—or the institutions by which we were nurtured and sustained? Have we degenerated in intellect, in spirit, in enterprise, in courage, in any of the loftier attributes which distinguish our high-minded kindred beyond the ocean? How proudly and triumphantly might we, in reply, point to these twenty-four vigorous and flourishing republics, extending over half a continent, the very existence of which, three hundred and

forty years ago, had not been dreamt of by European philosophy! Does the history of our world furnish a parallel to this? A little more than two centuries since, and an Englishman had not found a home in all this then vast savage wilderness. Now, within the limits of our own republic, we have a population of thirteen millions—eleven millions of freemen—and at least ten millions of British descent.

Nearly the whole of the colonists, within the original territory of the United States, were English. They left the parent island precisely at a period when the great mass of the people were most intensely engaged in canvassing all the fundamental principles and established dogmas of government and jurisprudence. And they themselves belonged to the unsuccessful party which contended, with a Roman energy, for the inherent, unalienable, indefeasible rights of humanity. They came hither because they had been defeated at home—and for the very purpose of enjoying unmolested in the *New World* that liberty which they despaired of attaining in the *Old*.

They came hither, moreover, freed from the galling fetters of baronial lordship, and from all the prescriptive claims and vexatious tyranny of a feudal aristocracy. When they landed upon these dreary shores, they were equals—they were brothers—they were freemen. They instantly commenced the bold experiment of self-government. They had fled from oppression—they had resolved to live free or die—and they have never yet been subdued; or deprived of the advantages of a popular

representative government. In their infancy, it is true, they were neglected and overlooked—and suffered to struggle onward to maturity as best they could. The infant, however, soon became a giant: and he was conscious of his strength.

It was then that British paternity was excited to look more carefully and tenderly after its exiled, friendless, unprotected progeny in the deserts of remote America. Our gallant fathers had given some tolerably significant demonstrations of manhood in aiding their worthy parent in the conquest of the Canadas, and in wresting from the Bourbons the last vestige of their transatlantic continental dominions. Whether this rather unexpected occurrence served to awaken the jealousy or the cupidity, or both, of the British government—it is certain that they forthwith commenced a new system of legislation for their then comparatively prosperous, warlike and powerful colonies. Their object was twofold: 1st. To depress and gradually to annihilate the growing martial and commercial spirit of our people. And 2d. To extort from us a revenue, both by direct taxation, and indirectly by rendering us absolutely dependent on themselves for all the products of mechanical and manufacturing industry. Had Great Britain succeeded in her purpose, we had not only been taxed at her pleasure, but our trade would have been restricted to the ports of the parent state, and we should not, at this day, have been permitted to make, out of our own native iron, a hoe or a hobnail. Such was the splendid project of the British ministry to aggrandize Old England, by converting her

American offspring into hewers of wood and drawers of water for the benefit of her pampered gentry at home.

But, did she succeed? Ay, that is the question—and when did an American blush to meet it? Did England succeed in crushing the English spirit of her American yeomanry? Every schoolboy can give the proper answer. He has got the whole story of the revolution by heart. He has followed the American standard, with streaming eyes and exulting heart, from Lexington and Bunker's Hill to Saratoga and Yorktown.

Almost the first lessons that I ever received from the lips of maternal affection, were the victories and privations, the exploits and the sufferings of the patriot soldier. And the first mortal name that I learned to pronounce with almost religious veneration was the name of Washington! And when the news arrived (I was then a little lad at school) that the great Washington was dead—we all felt and wept as though we had lost a father. Such another scene of spontaneous and universal sorrow I have never witnessed—nor will the impression be effaced while memory endures. None of us—I mean the children at school—had ever seen him—but our fathers and mothers had seen him, and had told us all about him—and we were in the vicinity of many of his disasters and of many of his brightest achievements. I beheld grief and dismay in every countenance. None so poor, so mean, so ignorant, as not to mourn on that occasion. I should have been shocked, child as I was, had I met with one cheerful or smiling face. The whole land wore the garb of bereave-

ment, and the language of sorrow flowed from every tongue. When did king or emperor—when did hero or conqueror die—and leave a nation of freemen in tears?

But it is not my purpose to portray the character of Washington nor to pronounce his eulogy. I shall not attempt even a review of the principal transactions and events of his extraordinary and singularly fortunate life, nor of the consequences which have resulted, or may yet result, to mankind, from so august and imposing an example of disinterested and holy devotion to the cause of liberty and human happiness. I have not been allowed the leisure necessary to do justice even to my own humble and inadequate conceptions of the magnitude, importance and momentous bearing of these high topics. Such themes demand a master's pencil and an angel's tongue.

Under other circumstances, a glance at the prominent features and occurrences of the past century might have been expected: and their exhibition, after due research and skilful grouping, might have proved instructive, and afforded scope for much apposite comment and deduction. But to condense the voluminous records of a hundred years within the compass of a speech—or even to seize upon the most striking incidents, and to adorn them with the magic drapery of classic diction, is not the province of extemporaneous impulse, or of a few hours of hurried feverish premeditation.

From the birth of Washington in 1732 to the present day, war and pestilence, in every part of the globe, have inflicted their full measure of calamity, woe and death. Oceans of blood have been shed. Kingdom has been

dashed against kingdom. Revolution has succeeded revolution. Kings and princes have been tried and executed as malefactors—or have wandered as exiles and paupers over the face of the earth. Ancient establishments have been cloven down by an infuriated populace or by a mercenary soldiery. The throne and the altar have been trampled under foot. Royal dynasties have been blotted out, or exchanged for military adventurers or citizen patriots. Colonial dependencies have been transformed into independent kingdoms or republics. The land of Kosciusko has been partitioned and enslaved—while the country of Leonidas and Themistocles has regained its sovereignty and freedom. The whole European family of nations, with all their American kindred, have undergone changes more or less radical, and tending to future results, which no political prophet will yet venture to announce or describe.

In the midst, however, of all the tumult, uproar, convulsion, carnage and devastation which have pre-eminently characterized this remarkable period of our world's history—science, philosophy, letters, the mechanical and the fine arts, poetry, eloquence, religion and popular education have advanced and prospered beyond all previous example. As have also associations and institutions for the amelioration of the human character and condition in every variety of form. Here is presented the bright side of the picture. The revolutionary and the martial spirit has not been abroad in the earth, merely to overwhelm, to destroy and to conquer—or merely to aggrandize the few at the expense of the million. A silent,

unobtrusive, healthful, counteracting influence has been constantly exerted over the conflicting elements of human passion and ambition. Though war, with all its tremendous attributes, has raged among the nations, yet no return of savage barbarism has been witnessed. The Goths and Vandals have not again been let loose to exterminate the crumbling monuments of an antiquated civilization—and to erect upon the ruins an iron despotism of ignorance, superstition and cruelty. There was too much light and knowledge and philosophy and religion in the world to permit such a catastrophe. But for these, the *dark ages* might have revisited the fairest portion of the European continent. And the ferocious Cossack might have enacted in Paris the same tragedy which his ancestor had done at Rome, or the Saracen at Alexandria, or the Turk at Constantinople.

But a thousand gifted benevolent spirits had been at work, for a dozen generations, all over Christendom—and by the aid of the printer's art, had diffused the principles of self-preservation, and of invincible resistance to any permanently ruinous encroachments upon the general stock of moral and political immunities already secured. The world could not be driven back by any modern Attila or Omar or Tamerlane. Intellectual and moral power, when possessed by the body of the people, will ever triumph over every species of mere brute force. It will not be pretended that the present condition of the people in Europe is worse now than it was fifty years ago. Whether they have gained a fair equivalent for all their sacrifices and sufferings, is a ques-

tion which philanthropy, perhaps, might hesitate to answer.

Whether, for instance, the progress of intellectual improvement has been accelerated or retarded by this universal warfare—whether it would have been less, equal or greater, had uninterrupted peace prevailed—can never be known. That it has been rapidly progressive, is certain. Every field of inquiry has been more extensively and minutely investigated—every department of literature has been enlarged and enriched—all the physical and experimental sciences have been, in a great measure, created—while the exact sciences have been carried almost to perfection—mechanical ingenuity, invention and discovery have imparted a totally new character to the useful arts—Franklin, Arkwright, Watt, Fulton, Whitney, Davy and others have demonstrated to the world the value of science in every branch of productive industry. Ethics, political economy, jurisprudence, legislation have advanced, more or less, towards systematic maturity. When, therefore, we contrast the existing aspect of the world with what it was a century or even half a century ago, we shall not complain because more has not been achieved, nor murmur at those dark and distressing dispensations of Providence which no human wisdom or power could prevent or control—and the bearing of which upon the destinies of mankind we may be utterly unable to estimate or to comprehend.

Ten millions of human beings, it may be, have been slaughtered in Europe and America, since the grand revolutionary movement commenced. We have no standard

by which to measure or estimate the value of such a sacrifice. Has it benefited the living? Will it benefit posterity? These are questions which we may reasonably ask—and in which, we, as Americans, are deeply interested.

The American revolution was not merely the precursor—it was the occasion and the mainspring of all the revolutions which have followed. Or, at any rate, it has imparted to them a more distinctive and popular cast. The example of America has been uniformly hailed, and appealed to, and held up to the admiration of the people, whenever a revolution in government has since been attempted. Her adventurous and glorious career has been the constant theme of study and excitement among the restless, the discontented and the oppressed. Her good fortune has been invoked in every similar enterprise, and an equally happy issue has been frequently anticipated and confidently predicted. And why has every experiment hitherto failed to realize the sanguine expectations of the friends of liberty and equal rights? Why could not France or Mexico or Colombia or Spain or Greece or Belgium achieve what thirteen poor English colonies completely effected—without the least domestic confusion or fraternal carnage? I am not now inquiring whether they have not gained much—very much. But why they have not gained *all* for which they struggled and fought—*all* at which *we* supposed they were aiming. Why they have not succeeded to the same extent that our fathers did, when they resolved on national emancipation:

This inquiry recalls us to the period of our Washington's severest trials and most eminent services. What was there in the peculiar character and circumstances of the English American colonies which, previously to the commencement of hostilities, augured and promised a more auspicious result, than was likely to follow any similar efforts in Europe or Spanish America? The usual answer is, that the Americans were more enlightened and more virtuous than any other people. I apprehend that the fact, if admitted, does not meet the difficulty or account for the difference in the cases supposed. That intelligence and virtue among the people will insure a large measure of civil and personal liberty, is not doubted. But that they necessarily lead to political liberty, or to the establishment of a republican representative government, cannot be assumed.

In Prussia, Austria and all the German Principalities, the people are universally well instructed, orderly, moral and industrious. They have more common schools, more universities, and a larger proportion of thoroughly learned men, than any other countries of either hemisphere. And yet their governments are absolute monarchies, and infinitely less disturbed by popular commotions and innovations than those of Italy, Spain and Portugal—where the people are proverbially ignorant, degraded and vicious. In France, too, at the crisis of the first revolution, the people were not much in advance of their neighbours beyond the Alps and the Pyrenees. Whatever cause may be assigned for that abortive revolution, it will not be ascribed to the unanimous determination of an en-

lightened and virtuous people to be free, under a government of their own creation.

In Sweden, Denmark and Holland—which, next to Germany, are the most enlightened portions of the European continent—no approaches to republican institutions have been witnessed during the last century, whatever additional rights the people may have acquired. Contrast also the condition of Scotland and Ireland. The common people of the latter are more ignorant and more revolutionary than any other people in Europe.

Germany ought to be the freest portion of the globe—that is, if freedom and self-government are regarded as synonymous or correlative—and if the greatest amount and most extensive diffusion of *literary* knowledge tend directly to its acquisition.

The theory is defective—and other elements must be taken into the account. The German *people*, and I may add, the European *people* generally, have not, since the usurpation of Julius Cæsar, been in the *habit* of meddling with political affairs, or of taking any efficient part in the business of government. On these subjects they are not permitted to read much—nothing, indeed, beyond the text-books purposely prepared for their instruction in orthodox loyalty and obedience. But even the most unlimited license, on this score, would not suffice. They could not learn from books the peculiar mysteries—or, without experience, acquire any definite ideas—of popular representative systems. Even in France, at this day, the system is but a sorry caricature of England's boasted constitution. And, in England, even when *reformed* to

the entire contentment of Earl Grey and his noble compeers, we shall find little to remind us of the thoroughly popular machinery of our own government.

Much as we are supposed to have borrowed from England—much as our institutions are reputed to resemble hers—it is notorious that Englishmen seem absolutely incapable of comprehending the genius and practical operations of our government. When they speak of the *people*, they mean the populace—the rabble—the mob—and without an aristocracy, in some form, to control their anarchical and tumultuary tendencies, they cannot conceive of any stable security for life or property or law or religion. Now we have no *populace* in the European sense of the term—we never had a populace. We have never been exposed to popular riots and insurrections. Nor have we ever needed a standing army to overawe the people or to sustain the government. We have but one *order*—and all the people belong to it. One homogeneous mass of free and equal citizens.

European revolutions cannot be expected therefore immediately, under any moral or intellectual training, to eventuate in those forms of simple democracy, and universal suffrage, and popular representation, which to us seem so natural and obvious, and without which we are apt to fancy there can be no liberty and no happiness. The people must have *political* training—they must acquire the art of self-government, step by step,—and hence a series of changes or revolutions must take place before they arrive at our modes of thinking and

acting—if, indeed, such a consummation shall ever be realized. The people may be seduced and misled and deceived by *names*—but they always *act* from *habit*. A President and Congress might abundantly satisfy a discontented people, who had heard of their good fruits in America. And yet the President and Congress might *govern* such a people very much after the fashion of King and Parliament, without exciting a murmur of jealousy or suspicion.

With our people, the case was totally different. They were generally pretty well informed and respectably moral, it is true. But more than this—they had been trained and drilled and disciplined, from the outset, in the business of self-government. It was their usage—their habit—a part of their very nature. Any other form of government was to them foreign—it was odious—it was tyranny. They learned the art from the very necessity of their position—in little companies and associations—a ship-load at a time—a settlement of a few hundred, frequently constituting a sort of independent commonwealth—and obliged to exercise all the rights of sovereignty and all the functions of legislation and government, to preserve tranquillity among themselves and to prevent or meet hostilities from the natives and their allies.

Our noble fathers—yes, they were noble, gallant spirits—nature's noblemen—we name them with pride and reverence—brought with them English hearts and English virtues—but, from the first, they were free from all direct English domination. They set up for themselves.

They elected their own rulers and legislators. Every man had a voice in the affairs of state. He voted, and was eligible to office. Thus they advanced in the art and practice of popular representation, and became habitually familiar with all the attributes, duties, privileges and responsibilities of self-dependent and self-governing republicans.

They were still the loyal, dutiful subjects of his Britannic Majesty. But they had their own parliaments, the members of which were chosen immediately by the sovereign people, annually or biennially—and, in some cases, even semi-annually. They had royal governors in many instances. But the colonial legislatures were always opposing them, and ever on the watch against the slightest encroachment on the rights of the people. They endured much vexation from this quarter—but they never suffered the arm of tyranny to be extended over them. When aggrieved they petitioned or remonstrated—but never yielded to injustice or oppression.

Their commerce and manufactures were regulated or restricted, in no very gracious manner, to suit the monopolizing policy of the British ministry. And on this score, they were subjected to many serious inconveniences and privations. Still, they were substantially and practically a free, republican, self-governing people—as much so as they are now.

We have been so long accustomed to read and hear of British tyranny, and of our emancipation from a sort of Egyptian bondage—that we are extremely apt to mistake the real condition of our ancestors, and to fancy

that they were slaves. Europeans fall into the same error, whenever they speculate about our colonial vassalage and present institutions. They view us as youthful adventurers, who have been and still are trying a very doubtful and perilous experiment. They concede that we have managed pretty well for some fifty years—but then it is even yet but an experiment of fifty years at most. And their wise men are still extremely skeptical as to the final result. They think that we must come to monarchy at last—or that a military despotism will be erected upon the ruins of the republic. And they refer us to Greece and Rome and to the fate of all other republics. They do not know—and we have ourselves nearly forgotten—that we have been learning the art, and trying the experiment of free government, of self-government, of republican representative government, for more than two hundred years. It is a libel on the character of our fathers to say that they were ever enslaved. They not only maintained inviolate and cherished most religiously, all the natural and all the constitutional rights and liberties of free-born Englishmen—but they reared up institutions and structures of a far more liberal and popular cast than England had ever known, or than England has yet dared to hope for. And all this too while they were dependent, though not servile colonists.

Possessing, as they did, a spirit and domestic governments so thoroughly popular—so radically and invincibly republican—it seems wonderful that the British ministry could have been so infatuated as to dream of extorting from them, by artifice or by violence, the very right, in

defence of which every Englishman would hazard life and fortune and sacred honour—the very right which lies at the foundation and constitutes the essence of English liberty—the very right, which, at home, would have been the last that any visionary or dementated statesman would have thought of invading or of calling in question. But this rash and fatal attempt was made. Be it remembered however—it was only the *attempt* that was made. Englishmen cannot be taxed without their own consent—legally given by their representatives in Parliament. We had no representatives in the British Parliament—neither Peers nor Commoners. The British Parliament therefore could not tax Englishmen resident in America,—without a palpable violation of the British constitution. The colonial assemblies were our only parliaments—and through their agency alone could taxes be levied upon our citizens for the support of the common government. The British ministry and Parliament however held a different doctrine—and, in the plenitude of their power and of their folly, resolved to tax the colonies.

Hence originated the war of our glorious revolution.—A controversy, at first, not for independence, but for constitutional liberty. The justice of our cause was not questioned, at the time, by any enlightened patriot in England. By all the world, it has since been acknowledged. Had we hesitated, Englishmen would have derided and scorned us as recreant, degenerate, cowardly apostates. Had we tamely yielded to British usurpation—had we conceded the legal right of Parliament to tax us at their pleasure—we had been slaves indeed. And

what we might have been at this day would not be worth the trouble of conjecturing.

It was a war, then, on our part, strictly of principle. It was not the amount or magnitude of the burden which was attempted at first to be imposed—it was not the paltry pounds, shillings and pence which were likely to be drawn from our purse—that caused an appeal to the sword. It was the vital, fundamental principle, upon which all free institutions rest, and without which there can be no liberty and no security—for which we contended. This principle of self-taxation—of unrestricted absolute control over our own property—of taxation *and* representation—we would not yield or renounce. We indignantly repelled every insidious effort to bring about its surrender—and we finally crushed, on the battle-field, all hope of achieving this favourite object by military force.

The struggle was long and fierce, and, to most human eyes, awfully doubtful as to the issue. Everything on our part was at stake. We had entered the lists, single-handed, against the most powerful and opulent nation in the world, and without one avowed friend even to cheer us onward. Our fathers saw full well the perils of their position, and the tremendous responsibility which they had assumed. But their only alternative was victorious war, or unmitigated hopeless servitude. *Liberty or death*, therefore, became their motto and their watchword.—They had been born free—they had lived free—and could they fail to transmit this freedom unimpaired to posterity? It was because they had ever been free, that

they deliberately preferred death to slavery. It was to secure and to perpetuate this freedom—not to acquire it—that they generously put all to the hazard against fearful odds. They fought because they never had been slaves—and because they never would be slaves.

We were then but a handful of people, scattered thinly over an immense territory, easily accessible at every point by hostile fleets and hostile savages, without money, without arms, and without military science, and suddenly plunged into a desperate contest with the proud mistress of the ocean, and the acknowledged arbitress of Europe. To all indifferent spectators it seemed a matter of course that British armies and navies would speedily triumph over all the opposition which we could possibly make—even though every man, woman and child had resolved to perish rather than submit. And when, even now, we look back upon that portentous crisis, we cannot help asking the question—what might not a British army of 50,000 strong, in one body, marching through our country, have effected? Humanly speaking, such an army might have exterminated our entire population. But if joined by the tories or loyalists, by the timid, wavering and selfish—the whole affair would have been quickly settled. Our Hampdens and Sidneys, our Fitzgeralds and Emmets, would have been hanged as rebels or traitors—as they have been in Ireland and in other countries—and the rest of the people would have been at the mercy of a haughty, vindictive and exasperated master.

We outlived the tempest and escaped the danger—

and from *free* colonies, became free and independent states. Our patriotic and persevering exertions were signally blessed and prospered by Heaven. As, in such trying emergencies, everything under God, depends on the capacity, wisdom and conduct of the leader, so were we provided, at the precise juncture when essentially needed, with a man to guide our counsels and to command our armies, in all respects equal to the mighty conflict. That God, in his goodness, does raise up and qualify extraordinary instruments to execute his great purposes in our world, cannot be doubted by any sober student of history or believer in revelation or in providence. Such a man was our illustrious and peerless Washington.

In him, from the beginning, and through all the dark and threatening vicissitudes of a seven years' war, his country reposed unlimited and unwavering confidence. His ability, his patriotism, his integrity, his prudence, his sagacity, his zeal, his courage, his judgment, his patience, his promptitude, decision, perseverance, were never questioned or suspected. His benevolence, dignity of carriage, imposing presence, kindness, magnanimity, disinterested devotion to his country, intelligence, urbanity, simplicity, perfect purity of life and manners, commanded universal respect, and won the hearts of all classes of the people. Of the soldiery, he was ever the idol of their most affectionate veneration.

Whoever reverts to this stormy epoch of our history—especially as it has been more fully revealed by the

recent publication of secret journals and diplomatic correspondence,—will be amazed at the difficulties, obstacles and embarrassments of all sorts, which were actually encountered and overcome. And who, he will be ready, at every successive stage, to exclaim—who, but a Washington, could have been sufficient for these things? Was there another man in America or in the world, who could have filled his station, or performed his glorious part in the grand drama, of which the half of Christendom was the theatre or the actors?

Under the auspices of Washington, the war was, at length, happily terminated. And Washington instantly sheathed his sword—disbanded his victorious weeping veterans—resigned his high office of Commander-in-chief—laid aside all the insignia of military pomp and power—and retired, without star or coronet or pension, a simple citizen farmer, to his plain republican mansion on the banks of the Potomac. Such a sublime spectacle had never before been exhibited in our world. It was in keeping with every previous act of his life. It was what every American anticipated as matter of course. It therefore excited no surprise at home. Our Washington was too well known to be suspected as capable of aiming at any species of self-aggrandizement whatever.

Here I cannot forbear to add one reflection respecting his military career, which has often occurred to me when perusing the history of other distinguished warriors, and which elevates the character of the former above all comparison. Washington never caused one drop of blood to

be shed unnecessarily or unrighteously. He never inflicted a cruel or unjust punishment. He never resented or revenged a private wrong or insult. He never provoked the imprecations or the tears of the widow or the orphan. The ordinary calamities of war, he mitigated in every practicable way. His humanity, forbearance and generosity were proverbial even among his enemies. And they dared to rely on his clemency and goodness, when they had forfeited all claims to his justice, by outraging the laws and usages of honourable warfare. This was a godlike trait in a character where all was noble, heroic and transcendent.

The close of the war, though brilliant and satisfactory to every patriot, presented new trials and unforeseen dangers. It secured independence to thirteen distinct republics—*united* in name only—while, in all the essential attributes of sovereignty, they stood aloof from each other, and seemed disposed each to manage its own affairs without regard to the will or weal of the rest. This too was a gloomy and disastrous period of our history. The services of Washington were again demanded. He was numbered first among the sages who framed our admirable constitution. He was elected by the people to organize and to administer the new government: and with what efficiency, wisdom, equity and success, need not be told. Washington was then confessedly the only individual who could have united the suffrages of his countrymen, or commanded for the Union the respect of foreign nations.

If our Union has proved a blessing—Washington must

be regarded as its father. If our constitution and general government have made us a great and prosperous and powerful nation—let the meed of praise be awarded to Washington.

IN PEACE THEN AS WELL AS IN WAR—AT THE HEAD OF A NATION AS WELL AS OF AN ARMY—WASHINGTON WAS EVER FIRST—WITHOUT AN EQUAL AND WITHOUT A RIVAL.

Among other benefits and privileges, the Revolution has assured to us :

1. All the popular rights and institutions which we had previously enjoyed—together with infinitely better security for their future preservation.

2. National Independence—which has freed us forever from the vexatious and oppressive interference of a distant, jealous and unfriendly government; and which guaranties to us the pursuit of our own interests agreeably to the dictates of our own judgment.

3. Perfect equality of rank among all our people. For although, prior to the revolution, we had no hereditary nobility or privileged aristocracy, yet there were incipient indications of an approach to such creations: and, probably, a few years more of colonial dependence would have introduced among us a *patrician order*, which might have proved a lasting impediment to pure republican institutions. The tendencies of English measures and policy were evidently to this end. The practice of entailing estates had begun to prevail, to a considerable extent, in several of the provinces—and this alone would have given rise in time to a powerful aristocracy. It

was abolished by the revolution. The mother country had also, from time to time, supplied us with a few choice specimens of lordly excellence, in the shape of governors and military officers—but the article had never been naturalized upon our soil nor become incorporated with our system. In this particular, the genius of our institutions is as abhorrent from British feeling and usage, as if we had sprung from a different race. And to this day, our boasted equality is a source of exquisite satire and ridicule among British wits—who cannot comprehend how a plain mechanic or labouring farmer should wear a sword, or work his way into the halls of Congress. In England there is no sympathy between the upper classes and the plebeian operatives. Even Lord Grey, within a few months past, has been denounced and lampooned in most of the Tory Journals, because he condescended to receive with courtesy, in his official capacity, a Westminster deputation of honest citizens, headed by a respectable *tailor* and *apothecary!* England's hereditary aristocracy and ecclesiastical establishment will probably prove a far more formidable barrier to pure democracy or American republicanism than her king with all his royal prerogatives, or than any mere monarchical despotism whatever. While the former shall be maintained, no species of *reform* will confer on the people *all* the natural rights of freemen.

The decisive battle is yet to be fought all over Europe between the aristocracy and the people. The great mass of the latter have not yet, in any country, acquired the elective franchise—not even nominally or in its most

limited application. They are still an inferior—and, in many respects, a degraded caste.

4. Unlimited freedom of opinion—in regard to all subjects, religious, political, philosophical, speculative, practical. We may believe what we please, say what we please, publish what we please, teach what we please—pray, preach and worship as we please. We have no state religion—no inquisitorial tribunals—no secret police—no censorship of the press.

5. State offences are unknown among us. “It is a beautiful trait (says a foreigner) in the history of the American Government, that it has never shed a drop of human blood, nor banished a single individual for state crimes.” Contrast this one fact with the long catalogue of state criminals who have been legally murdered on the scaffold or the gibbet in Great Britain, since the reign of Charles the First, or even since the accession of George the Third.

6. Our property, lives, reputation, religion and rights of every kind are inviolable. They are intrusted to our own keeping. They cannot be invaded or infringed.

7. Freedom from all excessive and burdensome taxation. We have established a cheap government. And have demonstrated that a great and powerful empire may be well and cheaply governed at the same time.

8. A federative republic—adapted to any extent of territory, to every variety of people and climate, and to indefinite duration. Such, at least, is the liberal theory of our national and state organizations, that no natural limit can be assigned to their growth and expansion—

// provided the people themselves consent. And hitherto, their action has been, on the whole, sufficiently harmonious and efficient to warrant the strongest confidence in their stability

| 9. Prosperity—national and individual—utterly unprecedented—and which is, at this moment, the envy and admiration of the world.

| 10. A welcome and a safe asylum—a permanent and a happy home—for the injured, persecuted, unfortunate and wretched of every clime and of every race.

| 11. We have furnished an example and a model—which has already contributed much to enlighten the world in the theory and practice of government,—and which promises incalculable good to mankind throughout all succeeding generations. This glorious boon to the oppressed and benighted nations was confidently anticipated and predicted by our sagacious and catholic patriots. God grant that their hopes may not be as the dreams of the visionary!

Will these inestimable blessings be perpetuated amongst ourselves? Will our union be preserved, and our liberties be transmitted undiminished to the latest posterity? These are startling questions—and occasionally there are symptoms which render them painfully unwelcome and obtrusive.

Our Union *may* be dissolved. We may have a dozen or a score of petty, hostile, rival, jealous, selfish, miserable republics—but they will be *republics*, not monarchies. I will not suffer myself to dread such a catastrophe as probable. I barely admit it to be possible. Is there

living the American patriot who could wish to survive our national Union—or to witness the humiliating degradation which its dismemberment would entail upon the character and destinies of his countrymen? Washington has not failed, in his Farewell Address, to indicate the causes which might lead to so fatal an event, as well as the calamitous consequences which would inevitably result. May the spirit of Washington ever preside in our councils and animate the hearts of all our people!

That our republican *forms* will be permanent, I doubt not—because they are inseparable from the fixed habits of our people. Their *spirit* however may be utterly perverted and profaned. And this is the great evil to which we are peculiarly liable. We may retain all our favourite *names* and *modes*, and yet lose the essential prerogatives and healthful tone of celestial liberty. We may be cozened or flattered out of the substance, and be induced to rejoice in the empty shadow. The sun of liberty had gone down forever in Republican Rome, long before the conqueror of Gaul and Germany passed the Rubicon.

With us, a majority must of necessity govern. Let that majority become ignorant, corrupt and reckless—and who shall restrain them from any measures of injustice, violence or madness? Will they reverence a paper constitution which they can make or unmake, interpret or torture at their pleasure, or trample in the dust with impunity? A legislative body—always an irresponsible body—countenanced, sustained and impelled by an exasperated or infatuated majority, may deliberately consummate acts and schemes of high-handed villany and

despotism, which a Roman Nero or Turkish Sultan would blush to perpetrate or to think of. Washington foresaw these dangers also, and he has pointed out their only preventive, and the only preservative of our republican system in all its pristine purity, beautiful proportions and harmonious movements. Intelligence, virtue, religion—these are the pillars of liberty's temple. Without these, our republic will exist only in name. For although, as I have already intimated, these may not suffice to originate and establish a republican government in countries where such a government has never been known—yet, without these, no republican or free government will long be maintained in fact. Deprived of these safeguards, our people will be arrayed, party against party, in all the phrensy of malignant and uncontrollable passion. Then, no honest man will dare to express an opinion, or to appear in the councils of his country. Ten, fifteen, twenty millions of ignorant, venal, republican citizens—bought up, and goaded onward by factious desperadoes—may render existence more unbearable among Columbia's free-born sons than it now is or ever has been under any European or Asiatic tyrant.

So thought Washington:—"The alternate domination of one faction over another, (says he,) sharpened by the spirit of revenge, natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism; but this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism."

Let the warning voice of our sainted Washington this day be heard with filial reverence throughout these, at present, peaceful, happy and *United* States. Yes, we are yet peaceful and united. The demon of party strife has raged—is raging—and may rage hereafter—but Washington has taught us how to avert its desolating fury and to control its unhallowed ambition. If the paternal counsels of Washington shall be sacredly regarded, we shall be a moral, enlightened, religious, free, united and happy people to the end of time. And all nations will be eager and proud to follow our example, to imitate our virtues, to adopt our institutions—and will bless God that Washington has lived, not for America only, but for the universe and for eternity.

The age of Washington is the classic age of American history. It is a resplendent, a glorious, a golden age. The character of Washington may, without even the semblance of hyperbole, be pronounced in a single word—PERFECTION! So far, at least, as perfection may be justly predicated of any mere mortal man.

Among the great personages whom mankind have delighted to honour, not one can be designated as worthy of being adjudged his peer. How lovely and docile and dutiful in childhood—how nobly good and brave in youth and manhood—how wise, magnanimous, philanthropic, dignified, unostentatious, pure and single-hearted in all his unparalleled prosperity, and through every scene of his wonderful career!

In all the walks and relations of private and domestic life he shone with a beauty and splendour peculiarly his

own. He was eminently rich in good works—and envy dared not hate or revile him. He was the able, judicious and unwearied advocate of every useful enterprise and institution—of religion, order, morals, science and universal education.

He was an *American* in all his feelings, sentiments and policy. He belonged to no party—but to his country. Nor was his patriotism selfish or exclusive. His benevolence extended to the whole family of mankind. Though sternly just in all his intercourse with foreign nations—he exacted nothing which he was not heartily disposed to reciprocate. He observed the strictest neutrality towards the European belligerents, and laboured to convince his fellow-citizens and the world that this was and ever must be the genuine policy of the American government.

In him was no blemish which requires the oblivious mantle of charity from the partial biographer or from a grateful posterity. His entire life, from the cradle to the grave, is before the world—and it may boldly challenge the severest scrutiny.

His is a life to be studied, not merely by the warrior, the politician, the statesman, the philosopher—but by the humblest citizen of the republic. He possessed virtues and excellencies which all may imitate—though, in majesty and grandeur, none may ever approach him.

He was born in humble obscurity—but in him were blended all the elements which will ever insure pre-eminence under any circumstances. He would have been great and good—had the revolution, which made

him the *greatest* and the *best*, never occurred. He would have been, as he was, the most skilful, scientific and successful farmer in Virginia. And he would have been, as he was, respected, beloved and honoured by all his fellow-citizens. It seems ever to have been a maxim with him, that there is nothing worth doing at all which is not worth doing well. And another, not less important, that time is invaluable and that every moment must be improved. Whatever *he* did, therefore, was well done—and he never passed an idle or unprofitable hour. He resolved, while yet poor, to be independent—that he might be honest and useful. He therefore applied himself diligently to business, and to the acquisition of such knowledge as would insure him success and reputation. He was industrious and economical, not to amass wealth for its own sake, but that he might be virtuous, just and generous. It was this truly noble spirit of honourable independence, cherished from early youth, which preserved him from pecuniary embarrassment throughout the long period of his public services, and which enabled him to decline all pecuniary remuneration from his grateful country—and finally to manifest a princely hospitality and munificence, without a particle of princely parade, extravagance or ostentation.

Washington never flattered the great nor courted the multitude. He never solicited office. He was ever ready to serve his country, but never sought to govern it. He never resorted to artifice, intrigue or management for any selfish purpose whatever. If he was ambitious, it was to deserve the esteem of the wise

and the good—not to acquire power, wealth, honour or fame.

With him character—moral character—was everything from the beginning. He always acted from principle—from the highest, holiest religious principle. And by the force of character, he rose in the confidence, admiration and affections of his countrymen. Neither birth, nor fortune, nor family alliances contributed, in the least, to his exaltation. It was all the result of his own good conduct, sound sense, indefatigable diligence, uniform kindness, invincible integrity, devoted patriotism, moral courage, Christian magnanimity—and of that determined resolution, which is ever the attribute of superior genius and real greatness, to become equal to every occasion, emergency and enterprise which he was providentially summoned to encounter or to direct.

There have been many ambitious Cæsars—many illustrious patriots—many talented demagogues—many splendid traitors—whose glory and whose infamy are recorded in the everlasting page of history. Our country has produced a noble band of heroic warriors and gifted sages and accomplished statesmen—but, hitherto, no Cæsar, and but one Arnold.

OUR WORLD HAS PRODUCED BUT ONE WASHINGTON.

NOTE.—The foregoing Address, though prepared on short notice, and delivered when he was somewhat unwell, we have ever regarded as one of the author's ablest efforts. It was uttered in the presence of a large and appreciative audience, the very *elite* of Nashville, and his whole manner in its delivery was one of glowing eloquence—inspired by the greatness of his subject and the greatness of the occasion, both of which he deeply felt. As stated in Sprague's Annals,

when he had been speaking nearly an hour, and the bells rang for dinner, a prominent gentleman of the city, and withal a special friend and admirer of the Doctor, concluded to give him a gentle hint of the lapse of time, which was sometimes forgotten in the ardour of his public discourses. Occupying a seat immediately in front, he pulled out his watch and held it up until it caught the speaker's eye. Dr. Lindsley, as soon as he caught a view of the friendly monitor, paused for an instant; then raising himself up in an attitude of indescribable majesty, he said:—"Sir, this is an occasion which comes but once in a hundred years, and the man who cannot afford to lose his dinner, to-day, is no patriot." After a spontaneous thrill of applause through the audience, he resumed his unfinished sentence, and went on with the discourse, which was heard with increasing delight to the close. We remember well how it closed. It was a rare thing for him to quote a line of poetry: and that which he used on this occasion never appeared with the printed Address. But we find it in the manuscript copy, and we vividly recall the effect upon his audience, when, after pronouncing the words, "Our world has produced but one Washington," he repeated the following lines, attributed to Byron:—

"Where may the wearied eye repose
 When gazing on the great;
 Where neither guilty glory glows
 Nor despicable hate?
 Yes—one—the first—the last—the best,
 The Cincinnatus of the West,
 Whom envy dared not hate,
 Bequeathed the name of Washington—
 To make man blush, there was but one."—[ED.

AMERICAN DEMOCRACY.

[NASHVILLE, OCTOBER 5, 1842.]



AMERICAN DEMOCRACY.

IN FIVE PARTS.

PART FIRST.

AN ADDRESS TO FARMERS AND MECHANICS.*

THE three most important and useful classes of men in our world, are MECHANICS, FARMERS and SCHOOLMASTERS. These are equally essential and indispensable in every stage and condition of civilized society. They would have existed and been honoured in Paradise, had the first parents of the human race never lost their primeval rectitude and glory. Of the three, indeed, the mechanic may justly claim priority in the order of time, if not pre-eminence in dignity and utilitarian importance. If the Mosaic history be true—and I accept it literally—Adam must have been a mechanic before he became a gardener or a husbandman. He could neither dig nor plant, nor trim his shrubbery, nor gather in his fruits, nor grind his corn, nor bake his bread, without some rude implements which required mechanical skill in the construction. The very first occupation, therefore, of the first man must have been strictly mechanical. And from the commencement of human labour to the present day,

* Delivered at Nashville, October 5, 1842.

every species of industry has been, and still is, carried on by mechanical contrivances of some kind. You behold the evidences of this fact in the wigwam, the canoe, the grotesque habiliments, the fishing tackle, the hunting apparatus, the martial equipments of the savage, as well as in every cottage, mansion, workshop and cultivated field of civilized man upon our globe.

Every operation of the farmer, even the simplest and most humble, is effected by mechanical instrumentality. For example:—Contemplate a good orthodox loaf of bread; and think of the plough and harrow and horse-gear and sickle and wagon and mill, and all the other ingenious handicraft devices required to rear and cleanse and preserve the wheat, and to convert it into one of the most common and grateful necessities of life: and then deem lightly of mechanics, if you can. No state of social man can be found so barbarous or degraded as not to abound in various mechanical arts; even where agriculture itself is unknown or not extensively practised. Truly, “man is a tool-making animal,” as Franklin very sagaciously defined him.

My worthy friends, the mechanics, will perceive that I claim for them an illustrious origin and ancestry: and that, in antiquity and usefulness, I rank them second to none of the self-constituted, mushroom, upstart nobility of our world. Nor would they ever have been jostled from their high and palmy estate, had man continued to maintain his primitive innocence. Then, indeed, the mechanic, the farmer and the schoolmaster would have inherited the earth, with all its riches and honours.

There would scarcely have been occasion for any other business or pursuit. Adam was himself both mechanic and farmer or gardener, before he was banished from Eden. And he would have been the first schoolmaster, had he remained there a little longer—as he was in fact soon after that disastrous event. Unless the pleasant task of teaching “the young idea how to shoot,” devolved, in the first instance and for a brief season, upon his wife.

But how has the whole aspect of affairs been changed and marred and mutilated by the fall?—which “brought death into the world, and all our wo!” Ever since that fatal catastrophe, the very employments which were originally designed to engross the human faculties, and to dignify even angelic purity and intelligence, have sunk into comparative disrepute, and been forced to yield the palm to other pursuits and professions, which are the offspring of sin and rebellion. The labouring farmer, the industrious mechanic, the starving schoolmaster:—alas, what sorry creatures they are in the world’s estimation! And pray, who are now the honourable, the great, the wise, the famous, the proud, the arrogant, the powerful, the mighty? Why, to be sure, legitimate kings and dukes and lords; fortunate statesmen and politicians and warriors and jurists and divines and physicians and lawyers and rulers of all sorts; long-pursed bankers, merchants, speculators, planters, manufacturers, and the successful votaries of mammon of every character and complexion. All of whom flourish and luxuriate and riot upon the spoils and deformities and ruin which sin

has everywhere created and perpetuated. Were there no crime, no disease, no misery, no death in the world; the lawyer, the parson, the doctor, the politician, the judge, "*et id genus omne*"—for their name is legion—would be compelled to learn other trades, or to seek a residence in some more congenial planet. But, now, these are vastly important personages. They monopolize the learned professions—the army, the navy, the church and the state. And in order to insure a reasonable supply of the necessary evil, our country is filled with colleges and professional seminaries, where thousands of hopeful republicans are *being* qualified to tread upon the necks and to lead by the nose, our credulous farmers and mechanics.

As for the schoolmasters: their case is as hopeless as their office is thankless. By common consent, they are doomed to wear their lives out in drudgery, obscurity and contempt. They have no *status*, as the Scotch phrase it, south of "Mason and Dixon's line." They must possess a large measure of Christian benevolence, or stoical philosophy, or asinine stolidity, or vulgar obtuseness, to enable them thus to do penance and to suffer martyrdom by the year, without sympathy, reward, or prospective saintship. Now and then, a working farmer, and occasionally a working mechanic, do rise above their natural or rather conventional mediocrity, and stand erect among the honourable of the land. But who ever saw—who expects to see—a schoolmaster among the sages and legislators and governors of his country? Who ever fancied that a schoolmaster was fit to be sent to

Congress or to a foreign court? Or even to be made a constable, or justice of the peace, or militia captain, or county clerk? And when, or where, throughout the chivalrous sunny South, was a schoolmaster ever yet known to amass a fortune—by his own proper vocation?

These things ought not so to be. They result from a palpable violation of the original constitution—the Great Bill of Rights—that *Magna Charta*—granted by Heaven at the very first organization of human society. It is high time to recur once more (as politicians say) to first principles; to read the constitution aright according to the letter; and to interpret it agreeably to common sense and sound logic. Just in proportion as we can get back to the good old doctrines which were promulgated, and to the usages which obtained, at the period when the constitution was established for the equitable government and well-being of our first parents in Paradise, in the same degree and to the same extent, will all these anomalous obliquities disappear: and thus shall we behold the mechanic, the farmer, and even the schoolmaster, gradually elevated to their pristine rank and rightful dignity. A consummation most devoutly to be wished—by all the parties concerned! Virtue, intelligence and industry were then the order of the day: and these must reappear, in all their native beauty, if the labouring classes, here or elsewhere, would regain their lost patrimony, and reascend the throne from which they have been so unceremoniously hurled.

Here I may add, that the poor despised schoolmaster

is the natural, and might become the most efficient, ally of the farmer and the mechanic. If the three could properly understand each other and mutually co-operate in the grand work of reform, they might and would soon emerge from the "slough of Despond," and nobly triumph over all the humiliating difficulties of their unlucky position. They would speedily wrest the sceptre from the usurper's grasp; and compel their gentle masters, "the lords temporal and spiritual," to yield to their betters, and to mind their own proper works—which, by-the-by, would then be at least sufficiently harmless and unenviable. Our hardy workingmen would learn, and therefore be able to teach, the proud lesson of the great poet of Democracy, that:

"The rank is but the guinea stamp,
The man's the goud for a' that."

"The honest man, though e'er sae poor,
Is king o' men for a' that."—(BURNS.)

Mechanics and farmers have hitherto supposed that the least possible amount of intellectual discipline and furniture would suffice for them. This is a radical and ruinous heresy. They must aspire to the supremacy in the vast empire of mind, if they would attain the consideration which they covet. Ignorance and knowledge are always relative terms. What would pass for learning in one age or country, may be gross ignorance in another. If mechanics and farmers would be as influential and respectable as lawyers, they must become equally intelligent and learned. And why should they not? They have leisure enough, and talent enough, and

money enough. It is their own fault if they neglect the means at their command. The farmers and mechanics in Tennessee have property enough among them, as a body, to provide for the education of all their children, as thoroughly as if all were designed to be gentlemen lawyers or physicians. How—in what fashion—this may be accomplished, I am ready to show whenever the parties most interested shall be disposed to give me a hearing.*

The great mass of the American people are, and ever must be, in the strictest sense of the term, *labourers*. In the country, these will generally be farmers:—in our towns, chiefly mechanics. Schoolmasters are, or ought to be, everywhere—in both city and country. And if the supply were equal to the demand or to the actual wants of the people, their number would greatly exceed that of the mechanics.†

* Should the question here be put, in its usual naked, isolated, sneering form: What! shall a young farmer or mechanic learn Greek and Logic, Philosophy and Mathematics? I answer, in the same dogged tone and spirit: Yes, to be sure; and if for no other end, that he may be able to break a lance with the flippant young lawyer, who knows nothing of the one or the other:—though he may affect an acquaintance with the whole cyclopædia of science, because he has lounged about a *something*, called a college, two or three months, and heard of phrenology, and had his own knowledge-box measured *secundum artem*; and because, moreover, he is permitted by democratic courtesy to rejoice in the potential suffix of an *Esq.* to his name! Besides, better read Homer and Locke and Newton, than to waste time, money and health at the grog-shop and the race-course.

† The number of white persons in Tennessee, over twenty years old, who could not write or read, according to the census of 1840, was 58,531; or *one* in *eleven* of the white population. In North Carolina, it was as *one* in *seven*. In the Union, the number was 584,547.

SCHOOLMASTERS may be distributed into four classes.

1. *A, B, C-darians*. Teachers of common or primary schools.

2. *Hic, Hæc, Hoc-ers*. Otherwise, *Verbalists* or *Grinders*. Teachers of the *accidence* in grammar schools and academies. Graduates fresh from college, with diplomas in barbarous Latin, which they cannot construe; and the meaning of which the subscribing and attesting *curatores eruditissimi* might be puzzled to divine. These, if clever, seldom remain more than a year or two at the business—barely long enough to discover their own incompetency, and to secure the means to improve their condition.

3. *Pedants*. Thoroughbred *Pedagogues*—and heartily devoted to their vocation.—*Head-masters* of the great schools. Teachers of the higher *forms* in the last, and of the lower classes in colleges. Always ready with bits and scraps of Greek and Latin to astound “the profane vulgar,” and to horrify the drawing-room exquisite. Lily, Busby, Bentley, Parr, were gigantic specimens of this goodly order. Rarities in our country at present. In their stead, we have plenty of *Greeklings*, smatterers, and pretenders to a thousand novel, cheap, short and easy methods of acquiring languages—whether dead or living.

4. *Dogmatists*. Professors and Lecturers, of every name and degree: who deliver their *dicta* or prelections *ex cathedra* to passive and silent, if not always to docile, attentive and delighted auditories. They are never contradicted or opposed. The field is their own.

They combat mere shadows, or men of straw, or fictitious antagonists,—created for the display of tact or talent, and for an easy triumph. They say what they please. Are accustomed to deferential respect from their pupils, and perhaps to the flattery and admiration of their associates. They may be honest in their inquiries, profound in their researches, confident in the truth and value of their theories and positions, and therefore imagine themselves free from illiberal bias, prejudice or influence. Hence it is quite natural that they should assume a tone and manner more or less dogmatical and magisterial; and that they should “think of themselves more highly than they ought to think.” (Rom. xii. 3.)

FARMERS. By this term, I designate all *free* persons who work in the field—who plough and sow and reap with their own hands—who literally cultivate and till the land, which they occupy either as owners or as tenants, or who labour for wages.

MECHANICS. All free persons who work in the shop—operatives in manufactories—apprentices and journeymen; not merely or chiefly, great proprietors of either land, slaves or manufacturing capital.

Farmers, Mechanics, Schoolmasters, therefore, embrace or comprehend the most ancient, the most useful and the most laborious vocations. Any plan or system devised or designed for the benefit of the real people, must have a principal reference to these; or it would be partial, imperfect and delusive. This position will not be disputed, so far as the farmers and mechanics are concerned—whatever may be thought of the schoolmasters. Let the

reader, then, if he please, reject the schoolmaster, and take for granted that when we hereafter speak of the people, we mean the farmer and mechanic.

Whether a government can ever judiciously interfere with the concerns of human industry, or so interfere as not to do more harm than good, is still an open, though *vexed* question, in the halls of legislation and in the cabinets of statesmen. As involving a general principle, and in a qualified sense, it has long since been determined in the negative by the great masters in the schools of Political Economy. With what reason, and to what extent, we shall see in the sequel.

As our own government is but the creature of the people, and can by them be made to assume any character or to adopt any measures,—it is evident that the people have the power to effect through its agency whatever they please. The first question then might be what the people *choose* to demand of their government—or rather what they ordain to be a government. Hence,

1. Let us consider or inquire what the people can do to improve or ameliorate the government.

2. What the government can and ought to do for the people.

3. What the people can do for themselves, without regard to the government.

An elaborate or satisfactory reply to either of these inquiries, would necessarily lead to a vastly wider range of discussion than will be allowable on the present occasion. Many topics must be omitted or barely hinted at: while others may receive a more prominent notice than

is strictly required by the argument. It is obvious, too, that a portion of debatable ground lies in the way: and it may not be easy to get over it or around it without giving offence. I shall probably say some things which will not be palatable to either Whig or Democrat.* My purpose, however, is not to please, nor to displease, the one or the other. If truth and reason be in my speech—good: if not, let it pass unheeded. I address the farmer and mechanic, in their proper character, as men and citizens. And to their honest verdict, as my peers and judges, I cheerfully submit. With partisan whiggery or democracy I have no sympathy or fellowship. And I equally spurn the humbuggery and selfishness of both. The terms, *whig* and *democrat*, mean precisely the same thing, when used to gain favour with the people.

Having thus “defined my position,” I proceed, after my own irregular fashion, to respond to inquiry No. 1. What can the people do for the government?

“The people are prone to expect too much of the government”—it has been proclaimed in high quarters.* No doubt, they may rely too much on the action of government, and expect more than any government can bestow. Men are very prone, when affairs go wrong, or when they are not as prosperous as they wish to be, to clamour against the government, or to call on the government for aid and relief. They ought, in most cases, to remember the advice of Hercules to the wagoner, and to apply

* “The people are prone to expect too much of the government.—The government has enough to do to take care of itself.”—(*Martin Van Buren.*)

their own shoulders vigorously to the wheel, in the first instance. Still the government is bound, in all its legislative enactments and provisions, to seek the well-being of the people—both directly and indirectly.

In our country, happily, the government is the mere creature or servant of the people—designed solely and exclusively for their benefit. Such, at least, it is in theory—and in the books. The government cannot have an interest or object or aim, distinct from that of the people. The interest of both is identical. It is one and the same—at all times and under all circumstances. A popular government, opposed to the will or weal of the people, would be a contradiction in terms. It would be a monstrous anomaly—the very worst species of disguised tyranny—of arbitrary, reckless and remorseless despotism.

Public offices were instituted for the welfare of the people; and not for the emolument of particular incumbents. No office was ever constitutionally created or intended as a reward for the past services of any man—much less for the venal remuneration of mere party services. Washington himself was not made President, as a reward, or even grateful acknowledgment, for his glorious military achievements. He was elected because he had exhibited to his country ample evidence of superior qualifications for that exalted station. Because both his ability and integrity were unquestioned and far above suspicion. And because it was universally believed that he would prove a better chief magistrate than any other citizen of the republic. The country—the whole people

—the entire nation—with one voice, sought him: not he the office.

In regard to every election and to every official appointment, the grand inquiry should be: who will best discharge the duties of such office or appointment? Not, who most needs the office to live by—nor who most eagerly seeks or covets it—nor who may have manifested the most skilful electioneering tactics, or may have been the most efficient political agitator or partisan—nor who may most loudly trumpet his own merits from the stump or at the hustings?

Men who boast of their own patriotism and devotion to the people, are not always the most disinterested or capable or honest. In fact, such demagogues are seldom to be trusted in any form or degree. They are usually the most arrant rogues in the community, however specious and imposing they may appear while courting the popular favour.

In general, too, men who run after office—who intrigue for it—who besiege the executive mansion, or beset the lobbies of our legislative chambers, or the private lodgings of the members, in order to get office—are most unworthy of confidence. They ought to be repulsed; and sent home to the cornfield, or off to Texas. Your genteel applicants for office are the veriest bores, loafers, idlers, exquisites, gamblers, blacklegs, *roués*, profligates, knaves, swindlers, bullies, desperadoes, braggarts, charlatans—in the whole world. And the worst of them, the most impudent, dashing and importunate, are always the most successful. They worried one old hero Presi-

dent [Jackson] all but to death, and they killed another outright [Harrison.] None but a stoic or “magician” or an “abstraction” could endure or withstand their incessant battery. Such fellows ought to be consigned forthwith to the penitentiary or treadmill.

Sterling merit is ever modest, retiring and unobtrusive. It must be searched for, as a hidden treasure—as a diamond in the quarry. It will seldom be found among the class known as office-hunters. Our credulous farmers and mechanics are continually mystified and gulled by the self-constituted guardians of their rights—who come before them with crafty speech and hollow professions, as the humble candidates for their suffrages. It would be curiously edifying, just to follow out one of these “friends of the people”—from his first busy canvass among the log-cabins, cottages, shanties, smitheries, barbacues and doggeries of his rural district—through each successive gradation of his upward career—until he is firmly seated in the national Senate, or upon the judicial Bench, or in the metropolitan Cabinet, or near a foreign Court: and to ask, what he *then* cares for the *dear*, ragged, clownish, hard-handed, rough-spoken *quondam* constituents, who once proudly hailed him as their champion, and caressed him as a brother?

He was, some ten or twenty years ago, your boon companion—always ready to chat with you, to walk and work with you, to “ride and tie” with you—would praise the good wife and kiss the sweet little bairns—call you by your proper names, right glad to see you, give you a hearty shake of the hand—eat your “bacon

and greens"—drink a "horn," and get gloriously social and generous at your expense—sing songs, tell stories, crack jokes, and all "that sort of thing"—until he fairly stole away your hearts, and enlisted you in his service. Look at him *now*—in the stately coach or lordly mansion—with all the pride, pomp and circumstance, with all the parade, trappings and insignia of high official rank and republican dignity. What is the manner of his greeting? How condescendingly gracious, and studiously urbane, and formally polite, and exclusively conservative! What a courtly air and presence! How punctilious and exacting in modish etiquette and ceremony! How awfully imposing in his whole carriage and bearing! How prince-like and prompt in repelling every unseemly familiarity and unseasonable approach! What accommodating faculties of vision, memory and recognition, has not he acquired? With what ineffable coolness and self-complacency he will *cut* you—whenever he meets you off your own ground, or within the "charmed circle" of his precious nobility! Is this your old *stump* orator—and the merry *royster** at the "brandy dance" and "coon hunt" and cabin fireside?

And then, his pretty little wife—whilom so plain, so frugal, so friendly, so joyous, so like your own! Does she wear her honours meekly? Behold her in the splendid drawing-room, "all made up" for exhibition by gas-light, and at a respectful distance! How magnificent and gorgeous in her apparel—how majestic and queenly in her every act and attitude—how radiant in beauty,

* *Royster*—used by Blanco White.

smiles and jewelry—how fastidious and tasteful in all her appointments! What a brilliant and dazzling spectacle for vulgar eyes to gaze at! And your privilege extends no further.

As to the youthful *dignities*—male and female—why, a dozen of your best cotton or tobacco crops, at present “whig prices,” wouldn’t pay for their outward head-gear—to say nothing of their interior adornment. A certain *William Shakspeare* is understood to have been a favoured guest on some such occasion: and he reports, that

“On each side her
 Stood pretty dimpled boys, like smiling Cupids,
 With diverse-coloured fans, whose wind did seem
 To glow the delicate cheeks which they did cool.”*

But, “tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis.” *Anglicé*: “Well, sure enough, there is no telling what some folks will come to.” “Set a beggar on horseback, and he will ride”—clear of the sheriff any day; ay! and carry off your purse to boot.

A species of official aristocracy, manufactured out of original low-bred cringing democratic beggars, may be met with in every part of the land:—Arrogant, haughty, domineering, insolent, overbearing, heartless—and vulgar withal.

Mr. Jefferson laboured, at the commencement of the Revolution, by annulling the laws of entail, primogeniture, and others affecting inheritances, to eradicate from the soil of Virginia the old aristocracy of wealth and office. He wished, as he said, “to make an opening for

* Shakspeare’s *Antony and Cleopatra*, p. 648.

the aristocracy of virtue and talent;" which he "deemed essential to a well-ordered republic."* I agree with Mr. Jefferson in this doctrine, as also in another, which restricts the presidential reign to a single term—though I differ from him about gun-boats, the qualified executive *veto*, and some twenty more of his visionary projects and peculiar fantasies. I treat Mr. Jefferson, you see, exactly as all other good whigs and democrats treat him. He is first-rate and all-sufficient authority when he is right—that is, when he is on my side—when he speaks according to "my understanding of the constitution." But when he is wrong—that is, against my creed or system—I hold him cheap, and let him alone.

Now, Mr. Jefferson, with all his sagacity, seems not to have dreamed that an aristocracy of office could ever possibly grow up under the new government then about to be established. He fancied that "virtue and talent" would be sought for and honoured by the people, and by the people's chief servant [the President.] Whereas, experience shows that impudence, profligacy and the basest sycophancy are the main requisites to success with either. This is our besetting sin. We elect bad men to office. Here is the root of the evil. Here we must begin the work of reform, and we must do it thoroughly; or we shall soon cease to possess a government worth looking after, or over which we could exercise control, even if we would. To aid you in this momentous work of timely and radical reform, I tender you a word of caution and advice.

Never vote for a man because he is poor. Never re-

* Tucker's Life of Jefferson, vol. i. p. 93.

ject or refuse to vote for a man because he is rich. Poverty is no qualification for office; neither is wealth. If you would help a poor man, give him money: or, what is better, provide him useful productive employment. A man who has squandered his estate foolishly or wickedly, or who has notoriously mismanaged his own private affairs, would not *therefore* seem to be the fittest person to grace the woolsack or the treasury bench, or to manage the affairs of a nation. A poor youth, with stout heart and honest purpose and generous aspirations, will create a path to honourable distinction: and in due time, like Franklin and Sherman, will command the confidence and respect which he deserves. Our thousand banks, and as many other moneyed corporations—our hundred thousand lucrative posts and stations, civic and military, state and national—hold out so many temptations to poor, do-nothing-would-be-gentlemen, that it has already become a sort of common law to regard all these snug places as their birthright, and to dispose of them accordingly. Of how many excellent blacksmiths and tailors and ploughmen and reapers, may not our country have been deprived by this unwise and anti-republican procedure?

Poverty, above labour and affecting gentility—cringing, sponging, tuft-hunting, toad-eating poverty—ever dangling in the train of wealth or power, or doing homage to a besotted populace for a few paltry loaves and fishes—a poverty at once too proud and too mean to help itself to honest independency—is entitled to no sympathy, and assuredly to no reward.

Never vote for a man because he is a federalist or republican or whig or democrat; or because he is for Van Buren or Clay or Tyler or Calhoun; or because he is known as the advocate or opponent of Bank or Tariff, or of any *test* measure, scheme or policy. The candidate who seeks to gain your support by the illusion of mere party names, or by pledges or promises or professions of any kind, is virtually tampering with your integrity, and is attempting to *bribe* you as certainly as if he were to proffer you gold or whisky or future office. This is in fact the usual and the most insidious mode of operating upon masses of the people. Their hopes and fears, their passions and prejudices are aroused and enlisted in behalf of any cause, and consequently of its boldest and fiercest champions,—without the slightest acquaintance with, or respect to, the real merits of the one or the other.

Virtue, capacity, intelligence, wisdom, integrity, ought to be the commanding attributes of public men—of all rulers, judges, law-makers. These constitute the only *right* or *claim* which any man can justly prefer as the ground of choice either by the people or the executive.

But how can we be assured of these high qualities in any man before trial? I answer, every man is on trial, in the presence of all his brethren, while a private citizen. And his true character may be always known, if you will suffer him to remain a private citizen long enough for a thorough trial. No man is fit for public life, who has not acted well his part in private life. While the man who has ably, faithfully, nobly, dis-

charged the duties and obligations imposed on him by his various ties, relations, pursuits, engagements and connexions, may be safely trusted anywhere and in any sphere. "He that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful also in much." (Luke, xvi. 10.) Here is a test or criterion, sufficiently accurate and obvious; by which our farmers and mechanics may judge of the pretensions of any individual. Let them look at the *man*—not at the whig or democrat. If the man be good and capable, he will not abuse your confidence, nor disappoint reasonable expectations. The less popular, the more truly respectable. A popular man, according to the common acceptation of the phrase, is always a mean, wordy, complying, crafty, deceitful *fox* of a fellow—who values you precisely at what you are worth to his cause or party.

Of course, this kind of evidence cannot be furnished by very young men—at least to an extent that may, in all cases, be relied on. When such are employed, as they often may and must be, in stations fiduciary, ministerial and executive; they should be selected according to the fairest indications of talent and moral worth, and without bias or influence from family, rank or party. The most important civil offices, however, particularly the legislative, ought never to be filled by young men. Legislation is undoubtedly the most solemn and momentous function which can be assigned to mortal man. Judicial legislation demands, or rather implies, the highest order and degree of intellect, judgment, wisdom, knowledge, experience, firmness, rectitude, candour, probity,

calmness and deliberation. Well might we ask: who is sufficient for these things? Though practically—among ourselves—the question rather is: who is *not* sufficient? The task which a *Moses* shrunk from at the age of eighty, is intrepidly essayed by any stripling in the land, who can muster words and brass enough to win the plaudits of the people. Fluency and strength of lungs, with an adroit “sprinkling” of cant phrases and party *shibboleths*, will convert the unknown boy of yesterday into the *crack* orator of to-day, and the “veteran” statesman of to-morrow.

The framers of all our constitutions seem to have copied after a false or inappropriate model, when they provided for the admission of very young men into the legislative or law-making body. They had in their eye the British Parliament: which was not, in either of its grand divisions, originally constructed or designed for the business of legislation. The House of Lords—once a mere advisory council of feudal Barons, or judicial tribunal assisting or relieving the *liege* in the dispensation of justice; [and still retaining a large measure of its primitive juridical supremacy—] became, by degrees, a branch of the law-making power of the realm. Thus, too, the Commons, at first, had no legislative duties, strictly speaking, to perform. Its members were elected by the boroughs or shires, as their representatives or agents, merely to grant their own money to the crown. Their vocation was simple and extremely limited. They determined the amount to be supplied, and the mode of raising it by a tax upon themselves; agreeably to the

immemorial and time-honoured usage or fundamental principle of the unwritten British constitution: namely, That taxation and representation go together—that money cannot be taken from the subject without his own consent. Of course, young men, duly instructed *quoad hoc*, were competent to this special service. They had only to express the will of their constituents—to vote the sum required or agreed on—and to return to their homes. In process of time, the Commons also assumed the higher and more distinctive faculties of national legislation. Still, the two Houses continued to be organized agreeably to ancient custom; although their character had undergone a radical change. Together, they had insensibly become the fountain and source of the entire statutory code of the empire. Young men, by birth and title, might enter the first: and young men were eligible to the latter. Both however held office so long—the one for life, and the other for seven years, with a moral certainty of repeated re-election—that they could, if they pleased, learn, as in a school, the science and mystery of legislation. At any rate, among such a host of grave and “reverend seniors,” little inconvenience was likely to result from youthful indiscretion, zeal or ignorance.

Between them and us there is, in this respect, a wide difference, and but small analogy. We have no permanent or hereditary senators—none of sufficiently long continuance to constitute a school for the instruction of their juniors. We elect for one or two years: and we are perpetually changing our representatives. A young

man of twenty-one or twenty-five, cannot learn much in a year or two. Nor can he, at that age, be presumed to be qualified to make, or to aid in making, good laws. Thus, one set of youngsters after another, in rapid succession, may, by the constitution, be intrusted with the entire machinery of our government. How far in practice we may have guarded against this constitutional defect, I shall not inquire. That our legislative assemblies are always the most venerable, peaceful, judicious, enlightened, courteous and exemplary—I think, even *we*, chivalrous, modest, immaculate Tennesseans, will not affirm!

In order to meet the case and to prevent future abuse, I would respectfully suggest a twofold amendment to all our constitutions, both State and Federal.

First. Let no man be eligible to a seat in any legislative body in our country under the age of fifty. He will have established a character for wisdom or folly by that time. And you may know him thoroughly. He will have passed the usual period of intriguing, corrupt, time-serving, place-seeking, “log-rolling,” inordinate, grasping ambition—as well as of bullying, swaggering, fighting and “renowning,” in committees of the whole, after dinner, or at the “races” on a holiday—taken without leave. Nor will he be likely to indulge in any of those glorifications, “sprees,” *winings*, brawls and “jollifications” which keep in a state of feverish excitement, alarm and terror, all quiet citizens during their interminable and most expensive sessions. He will have no occasion to address an empty house by the day or the

week, merely to eke out an electioneering speech for "Buncombe." Sundry other advantages might be mentioned—but I leave you to *guess* them. At present, they are capital debating clubs,—for timid college graduates to acquire confidence and improve their logic by daily practice, and to learn with how little wisdom the world is governed.

Second. Members of our legislatures ought to receive no *per diem* pay or wages. Then there would be no temptation for drivelling avarice or dwarfish gentility to covet the honour. I would allow them good fare at the public expense, upon the Washingtonian *teetotal* abstinence plan—and nothing more. Give them comfortable quarters and plenty of cold water.—Let them do their proper work soberly; behave with decency; amend or repeal all bad laws; and enact as few new ones as possible. And the sooner they are off, the better. Or if some pay they must have, let it be a fixed annuity—so much by the year, while in office. Thus a salary of two or three hundred dollars to members of a state legislature, and of one thousand or fifteen hundred to members of Congress, would insure both economy and profit to all parties.

Adopt and enforce these two very simple and obvious regulations; and you will have made a grand movement towards the amelioration of your condition in all respects. The legislature is omnipotent for weal or wo. It meddles with every interest and employment. It appoints to numerous offices, and fixes the salaries of all incumbents. It levies taxes, and appropriates the revenue, at

pleasure. In a word, like the British Parliament, it can do anything, except “make a man a woman, or a woman a man.”

It is a curious anomaly in the American system, that every legislature possesses the sovereign, independent, unrestricted power of paying its own members, and also of paying all public servants of whatever name or degree. To themselves, they vote as much as they *dare*,—with the fear of the people before their eyes, and in prudent deference to the coming *polls* and the irrevocable decree of the mysterious ballot-box. The daily pay, in the several States, ranges from one dollar and fifty cents to six dollars.* Where the pay reaches to two or three dollars or more, members contrive, by appropriating certain *extra* perquisites, under the general head of incidental or contingent expenses, to do a pretty good business. That is, by adding to their regular legal allowance of dollars the aforesaid “stealings,” they may, by prolonging a session to six or eight months, make a very snug job “in hard times” out of the people,—and the people be none the wiser all the time. While they thus betray a reasonable regard to their own interests, they make a grand parade of economy and self-denial, of their vigilant and jealous care of the dear people’s little purses, and of their extreme abhorrence of all big salaries and other wasteful aristocratic extravagance. So that they will spend time, worth *ten thousand dollars* to the people, in debating about an addition of *fifty* or a *hundred* dol-

* The lowest sum obtains in Vermont—the highest, in Louisiana. The *per diem* is four dollars in Tennessee.

lars to the salary of the most laborious and faithful public officer in the State:—or about voting a trifle to any object of manifest and permanent utility to the whole population.

The case of our worthy judges may serve as one example of the class referred to. How inadequately are they remunerated, in nearly all the States, for the most important services! And yet how incessant are the efforts and speeches, made at almost every legislative meeting, to reduce their salaries! Who can estimate the *cost* of these efforts and speeches?—Does it not frequently exceed in amount the whole annual charges of the judicial department of the State?

A word here of a plan for a good and independent judiciary. Appoint well educated *young* men of superior talents and great promise, first, to the Bench of an inferior court. Thence raise them to a higher; and so on, to the highest; according to seniority and merit—with a suitable increase of salary at each advance in rank. Let the judges of the supreme and other courts of the Union be selected from the ablest and most deserving of the State judges. Thus the service will become, as it ought to be, a regular profession, like that of the officers in the army and navy. A fair prospect of honourable promotion ever in view, will act as a stimulus to exertion and good conduct through life. Or, if elected without any such prospect or expectation and only for a limited period, then select the most accomplished lawyers; pay them liberally; and restrict them to a single term, that they may not be tempted

to prepare an electioneering train in advance, in order to secure a reappointment. I suppose it need hardly be insisted, that no man should be elevated to the Bench and decorated with the ermine, merely in reward for political party services and mercenary compliances. So gross an outrage upon every principle of decency and justice, could never find an apologist, except among the basest and most flagitious of depraved demagogues or tyrants. England has had her Scroggs and Jeffreys: and America—would do well to profit by the example!

Since our country is a democracy—at least, so the people rejoice to style it—I purpose to advocate democratic doctrines and institutions to the uttermost verge and meaning of the text. Let us then have democracy—thorough-going, out-and-out, fair-spoken, open-handed, consistent, universal democracy. A democracy that secures to every man his own, and concedes to every man his due. A democracy that insures the greatest freedom, peace and happiness to each individual, and to all the people. A democracy that deceives nobody, that vexes nobody, that wrongs nobody, that abuses nobody, that oppresses nobody:—That protects the weak, the helpless, the ignorant and the friendless; and that is uniformly just and generous to everybody. A democracy that yields gracefully to the will of the majority, and that never invades the rights or wounds the feelings of any minority. I go for the democracy of numbers. Give the people fair play; ample scope and a clear field; and let them steer the ship of state after their own fashion—right or wrong. Either this largest liberty—

this uncontrolled popular discretion, on the one hand; or the all-grasping, omnipotent "one-man power" on the other. There is no alternative, no middle ground, no half-way house. The danger imminent, is—that, under a masked battery, while certain honest men seem to contend for the people's sway, they are in fact rushing headlong together into the dictator's arms.

The people are changeable. True,—and let them change both men and measures as oft as they please. Allow them the opportunity, by frequent elections, to express their mind fully, frankly—and without bias from any "caucus," clique or wire-puller from behind the throne. Popular elections become less exciting, turbulent and mischievous, just in proportion to their frequency. Were governors and legislators chosen annually for instance, there would be felt much less interest in the issue, because there would be less at stake, than when they are chosen for a longer period. The disappointment of a defeated party would be no great matter, because they could try again in a year. Nor would it be worth while for candidates to waste their ammunition upon such meager game. They would stay at home, and leave the people to their own "sober second thoughts." In those States where elections are annual, and where the governors possess no peculiar power or patronage out of which to make "political capital" for their future advancement—and where especially, they cannot encroach upon the legislative department or nullify its action by the arbitrary interposition of the royal negative or veto—*there* the elections are usually very

quiet, decent affairs, compared with those of other States where a different usage obtains. Witness New Jersey, for example; contrasted with New York and Pennsylvania on either side.

Here I should have named Rhode Island, along with New Jersey, as the very Eden of democracy and contentment, but for recent occurrences. Sad proof, by-the-way, that all human sagacity may be at fault! That my own sage speculations may turn out moonshine! And that nothing will go right, until the world shall be thoroughly "Tammanized;" or "Gerrymandered" into "Chaos or Chimeras dire!"

Poor Rhode Island! Why, she was accounted and actually called "a democracy" more than a hundred years (1641) before the revolutionary ball was set in motion.* So pure and radical was her democracy, that no mortal dreamt of a possible change for the better. Her charter, dated July 8, 1663, though granted and signed by a monarch, [Charles II.,] was carefully prepared by *John Clarke*, the agent of the colony in England—with the assistance and advice, no doubt, of *Roger Williams* at home, the venerated fathers of the colony and of religious liberty. Under it, she has flourished and prospered, some two centuries, without having witnessed or tolerated a single act of tyranny or injustice. She took up arms at the Revolution to preserve, not to destroy her charter—and so did all her sister colonies.

* See Elton's *Early History of Rhode Island*, p. 213. R. Williams founded *Providence* in 1636. See *Burke's Works*, vol. ix. p. 411. See also *Goddard's Address*, p. 54.

If, when the war of independence was happily terminated, she found less to alter in the form of her government than did her neighbours, it was because there was less need of it. None of them adopted a more perfectly republican or democratic system than she had been accustomed to from the beginning. Connecticut also adhered to her charter, *mutatis mutandis*, until 1818: when she formed a constitution in compliance with the clamours of a *pseudo* democracy—less democratic however than was her time-honoured regal charter. New Jersey completed her task of constitution making two days before the formal Declaration of national Independence by Congress, [July 2, 1776.] It is the shortest and the best in the whole category.

In general, the excellence of our constitutions is according to the inverse ratio of their length. Should you be curious to calculate the absolute or relative value of a constitution: count the pages in any printed Book of the Constitutions; and by the rule just stated you may ascertain it to a mathematical certainty. Thus, when I find a constitution—as is the fact in most cases—ten times longer than that of New Jersey, I pronounce it but one-tenth as good, or tenfold worse.* These instruments are growing so rapidly in size among us, that

* Thrice happy and fortunate, dear good *old* New Jersey! In joyous tranquillity has she reposed ever since July 2, 1776. And should she continue to maintain unaltered, at least unenlarged, her precious little *handbill* of a constitution, for a hundred years to come, she will cause her *Broad Seal* to be respected by all true-hearted democrats—if not by a democratic House of Congress—and by her own dutiful sons the wide world over.

many of them have already become a species of codification; a kind of ill-digested, verbose compendium or abstract of jurisprudence; or substitute for the whole body of existing common and statute law. By thus attempting to define and regulate everything, they greatly embarrass honest men, and afford boundless scope to rogues, who always construe the text to suit their own purposes. All written constitutions are an evil at the best: and very long ones are worse than none, because they will inevitably be perverted to mischievous uses, and made the potent engines of legalized oppression and iniquity.

But I have not done with Rhode Island.

Had the task been assigned me, five years ago, to point out the most democratic commonwealth in the Union or in the world, I should have named Rhode Island first and at the head of the list. Her governor is powerless to do harm. He has no imperial *veto* prerogative. He is chosen annually. His salary is \$400. That of the Lieutenant-Governor is \$200. The Chief Justice is paid \$650, and each of the Associate Justices \$550. No people on earth govern themselves, or manage their public affairs at so cheap a rate. The members of both houses of the legislature are elected twice a year. They hold office only six months. Tennessee, by the latter test, is but one-fourth as democratic as Rhode Island: by the governor's official term, one half; and by his salary, only one-fifth as democratic. I give these as fair specimens of the logic usually employed in arguments and comparisons of this sort.

We have, here in Tennessee, made two constitutions within less than forty years—the first a pretty good, the last a very bad one. I am not going just now to specify its objectionable features or provisions.* I select one item [found in both] only, and that because it is analogous to the evils complained of in the royal charter of Rhode Island. We disfranchise clergymen; and declare them ineligible to a seat in the legislature. Now I defy the wit of man to designate a more flagrant violation of democratic principle and the equal rights of man, than is involved in this simple case. No ingenuity can conjure out of the Rhode Island charter, as interpreted by long usage, a totality of objections comparable to this one broad, naked, undisguised declaration of the Tennessee constitution: that ministers of the gospel are not to be trusted: that they shall not live among us as the peers of swineherds and “squatters” and wolf-hunters. I do not speak of the injustice inflicted upon the clergy *per se*. They may be a tricky, subtle, slippery, dangerous set of smooth-tongued hypocrites, and may richly deserve the *mark* thus set upon them. Grant them to be as bad as you please to represent them—as bad as the very *elite* of your honourable selves†—and lower, we cannot get, if we would—allow them, I say, to be as bad as the reputed *Hero* of Milton’s Epic, that arch deceiver, who has been enacting the angel, the priest, the prophet,

* The worst article in the new constitution is that relative to *taxation*: the *ad valorem* principle; tax on land; taxing *privileges*, etc. Liable to great abuse.

† The members of the Legislature, namely, who were present.

the politician and the democrat, as well as the “roaring lion,” ever since he despoiled our beauteous mother and her glorious lord of their celestial inheritance: It matters not: The reason or the excuse avails nothing. I speak of the principle—a deep, radical principle—which, if carried out in practice, might sweep away all your boasted franchises. For by the same rule, any other class, craft or profession might have been, or may yet be, proscribed or put under the ban of the commonwealth. The principle virtually assumed was, that a majority of the people were competent to proclaim and decree the utter disfranchisement of any portion or the whole of the minority. Thus the farmers, acting in concert, might have excluded the lawyers, doctors, merchants and mechanics—upon the very plausible and benevolent plea, that all these good folks had enough to do to mind their own business, and attend to the wants of their clients, patients and customers. I advise the farmers to go ahead—upon this hint.

Now I do not wish to get up a *Dorr-ic* war in behalf of the down-trodden parsons, nor to propagate democracy at the cannon’s mouth, nor to establish their claims to equality of privilege by demolishing the government. Had the charter of Rhode Island ordained that no shoemaker or barber should be eligible to office, there might have been ground for complaint, and remonstrance and reform; but not for revolution and bloodshed. Though even this would have been a trifle compared with the Tennessee enormity; because the clergy among us are a vastly more numerous body than either the shoemakers or barbers.

The Rhode Island troubles were created solely by agitators sent thither from abroad on purpose to sow the seeds of discontent—to foment discord, anarchy and rebellion. Left to themselves, the people were perfectly satisfied with their political condition. Or if not, they always had a remedy within reach—a lawful mode of redressing grievances, and of remodeling their constitution to suit their own views, was ever at command. There existed not a shadow of reason for tumultuary violence; nor for the sympathizing countenance and support of foreign revolutionists. Nor would they have ever perpetrated those insane fooleries, which have given notoriety and *quasi* renown to a second *soi-disant* “Mr. Equality,” who hoped to mount the throne by mob terrors and hireling cut-throats; had they not been instigated and maddened by the wicked spirit of a certain well known junta of atheistical conspirators against all government—human and divine. New York city was their head-quarters; with an efficient *corps* on duty at Boston. Genuine democracy had no agency in the matter. Nor is their commander-in-chief a whit more of a democrat than was his illustrious model, the duke of Orleans;—whose bitter experience of the tender mercies of an armed, drunken, infuriated populace, might serve as a warning to all like-minded adventurers, to run away in good season, and in “double quick time.” The name, the watchword, democracy, was used and abused, just as liberty, religion, reason, are currently used and abused, to serve as a cloak, a pretext, a blind, to mislead, entrap and betray the weak and unsuspecting.

No popular revolution, according to Lord Bacon, and to universal experience, was ever successful unless headed by the aristocracy: who, also, are usually the first to perish from its violence. "The victims lead the procession that conducts them to the knife." "There is but one step," roared Mirabeau from his stormy tribune, "from the Capitol to the Tarpeian rock."

The elemental principle of democracy is, that the will of the majority, freely ascertained and legitimately declared, is paramount and must prevail. Every project to undermine, counteract, pervert, destroy or paralyze this principle, is direct hostility and treason against democracy. Have not the people of Rhode Island an indefeasible right to choose their own form of republican government, without let or hindrance, counsel or menace, from abroad? Would we, of Tennessee, permit Virginia or Mississippi to instruct us, or to force improvement down our throats, as the British *dose* the Chinese with opium, by means of powder and lead, bayonets and Paixhan guns?

This most ridiculous Rhode Island farce, which had well-nigh proved a tragedy, was brought about exactly after the manner in which false democratic Catilines always play their cards. Their sole object is self-aggrandizement—office, power, money. This is the secret dominant motive with them. The pretext put forth to operate on others is, that the people are poor, miserable, oppressed—and ought to be relieved. They say to the dear suffering people: follow us; we are your friends; we will rid you of tyranny, hang your lordly

masters, and give you the spoils of victory. Whereas, if these same whining, patriotic, disinterested Catilines do succeed, they incontinently seize upon the sceptre, the sword, the purse, the law, the State; and forthwith enslave and crush the whole mass, rich and poor, high and low, together. Two words, namely, "Royal Charter," constituted the entire *staple* of the argument wielded by the "new lights" in the present case. Not a few honest souls—old women and young women—were sadly frightened, and made to believe that Rhode Island and Providence Plantations were still governed by Charles II. and a Tory Parliament! And many of our newspaper editors seem to have been no wiser.*

To prevent even the appearance of inconsistency in these remarks, I submit a word explanatory. Democracy then does not proffer everything to everybody; nor promise to gratify everybody's wishes, schemes, or caprices. It may deny, reject, withhold, refuse—when proper. It may restrain, imprison, punish in many ways—when necessary. The people may ordain, that no man under fifty years of age shall make laws for

* All demagogues profess to be democrats. They act, throughout, as did the first grand counterfeit democratic demagogue, who gently approached the ear of mother Eve with words of music and flattery and promise and sympathy. "Your condition is not quite so good as it might be, as it ought to be, as it easily can be: nay, it is positively a bad one. Listen to me, and it shall be improved. I will make you wiser, richer, happier, better. Eat this delicious fruit; and 'your eyes shall be opened: and ye shall be as gods.' 'Ye shall not surely die.'" She listened: and the villanous, lying, old serpent of a *make-believe* democrat robbed her of everything. Why, he didn't leave her a *pica-yune* to buy an apron with!

them.—That no man who cannot read and write, or who is a drunkard, or swindler, or thief, or robber, or duellist, or gambler, or assassin, shall be eligible to office. But if they were to ordain, that no broker or barber, no Catholic or Quaker, should be eligible to office: all the democratic world would cry out, shame, injustice, oppression! With good reason too. In the first case, individuals only are affected, and for the want of personal qualities which they might have possessed or may yet acquire; or for personal obliquities which they might have avoided. In the latter case, entire classes and sects are wronged without regard to personal merit or demerit. So that the highest order of intellectual and moral worth would be of no avail to them or to the public service. Let this broad distinction be kept in view.

Democracy seeks the greatest happiness of the greatest number. But in such a way, I repeat, as will do no injustice or unkindness to a single human being.

Here I may as well enunciate another aphoristical truism, or recondite paradox, as my hearers shall choose to accept it. All ungodly priests wish to be popes: each is in fact a little pope at heart: but when they find it impossible to become big popes in severalty, they change their tactics, denounce the popedom, preach up ecclesiastical parity, and confer on a multitudinous unity, namely, upon their own entire reverend fraternity, all the attributes of an infallible supremacy. So it is with selfish politicians. All aim at and covet the royal diadem. But when the many cannot secure it, each for himself, they unite in declaiming against all sorts of

monarchy; and then assume in partnership and for the sole behoof of the firm, absolute dictatorial powers. Thus reigns king Party, king Whiggery, king Democracy, king Lynch, king Mob, king Caucus and king *Sans Culottes*. Thus reigns pope Presbytery, pope Independency, pope All Creed, pope No Creed, pope Surplice and pope Broad Brim. Right sturdy kings and popes—all of them!

How our honoured sires regarded all these matters, I stop not to inquire. It is certain that, in framing the great national constitution, they did not foresee and provide for many contingencies which have since arisen to perplex and harass the general mind. Experience has exhibited some defects, and it suggests a few amendments. That such would be the result of experience, they fully anticipated: and therefore wisely prescribed the mode by which additions and alterations might be effected. All angry disputes and controversies about the meaning of any article, or about the powers conferred by it upon the Federal Government, might be avoided or amicably adjusted, by a simple appeal to the people for a renewed expression of their will in the premises. The initiatory measures for such reference, with a view to any contemplated amendment or modification, may be taken by Congress or by the State Legislatures. To such a course, consistent democracy could never object.

I shall advert to the legitimate modes of interpreting the constitution presently: and also to some amendments which the exigency of the times loudly demands.

I must however be permitted first to glance at a few other miscellaneous topics, which properly belong to the

main subject of this discourse, though they do not readily fall into any precise form of logical arrangement.

1. "The majority govern." True: But only by electing to office proper men. Not by governing them or dictating to them when so elected. They are then to act freely; upon their own responsibility; according to established usage and principles; in the honest exercise of their judgment, intelligence and wisdom: without fear, favour or affection. They are amenable only to the laws, to the judicial tribunals, and to public opinion. If the people do not like them, they will not vote for them again. Nor can public men, that is, the people's servants, justly complain when they are turned out, or rather left out of office, by a fair legitimate expression of the sovereign will. It is thus that the majority govern, or ought to govern.

Men in office—presidents, governors, judges, legislators—are the officers, magistrates or servants of the whole body of the people—of opponents as well as partisans, of whigs and democrats. All are obligated to obey and to respect them, in their appropriate official capacity. They ought *then* to be above party influences, prejudices, passions and interests.

When the Constitution of the United States was finally adopted by a majority of the people of each State, it became of course the constitution of the whole republic. Its adversaries, even those who had been most fiercely hostile to it, were immediately as much bound by its authority as were its authors and advocates. Thus it is with any law duly enacted: all must submit to it,

whether they approve it or not. Every open or debatable question of this sort is determined by the adoption of a constitution, by the passage of a law, by the ratification of a treaty, or by the election of a candidate.

We select men to make and to administer the laws in our stead and behalf, upon the presumption at least, that they are wiser and better qualified than ourselves for the work:—just as we choose our tailor and doctor. Any attempt to *teach* either would be absurd.

2. Hence the doctrine of “Popular Instruction,” as commonly understood and practised, is unreasonable, contrary to the genius of democracy, and a direct infringement of individual rights and personal freedom. When this species of instruction amounts to a command, it is unconstitutional, and ought to be disregarded. Otherwise, the constitution itself becomes a mere nose of wax, in the hands of the wily demagogue: who is often able to flatter and wheedle the multitude into a violation of both its letter and spirit, in order to promote his own schemes of self-advancement. There is something extremely preposterous, if not ludicrous, in the very idea of a county or district assemblage of the people, hurrying through the approval of a set of resolutions, got up by some cunning scoundrel, to be forthwith despatched to the metropolis, as the solemn, elaborate and well-considered expression of all the wisdom among them!

3. Nor is the allied doctrine of “Legislative instruction to United States Senators”—requiring them to obey or to resign—a whit more democratic, justifiable, expedient, wise or constitutional. It is directly subversive

of the basis or principle upon which that body was organized. The Senate might thus be converted into a mere pliant tool of the Executive or of any prevailing faction.*

A senator is not merely the representative of his own legislature or of his own State. He is bound to look after and to promote the interests of all the States. He is a national legislator or statesman—appointed to make laws for the whole Union. The constitution evidently designed that the Senate should be equally independent of executive influence and control on the one hand, and of popular caprice, passion, prejudice, on the other. The legislature, as individuals, simply choose the senators; or are the qualified electors of senators; and afterwards have nothing more to do with them.

The final draft of the constitution,† as reported to the convention, near the close of its sessions, by the committee of five, contained a section providing that the senators and representatives should be paid by their respective States. This section was altered, because, as it was ably

* “The small number, and long duration of the Senate, were intended to render them a safeguard against the influence of those paroxysms of heat and passion, which prevail occasionally in the most enlightened communities, and enter into the deliberation of popular assemblies. In this point of view, a firm and independent Senate is justly regarded as an anchor of safety amidst the storms of political faction.....The characteristical qualities of the Senate, in the intendment of the constitution, are wisdom and stability.” (*Kent's Com.*, vol. i. p. 226.)

† This draft was *reported* August 6, 1787. Article 6, section 10, was as follows: “The members of each House shall receive a compensation for their services, to be ascertained and paid by the State in which they shall be chosen.” (*Yates*, p. 259. “*Secret Debates.*”)

argued by Mr. Carroll: "The Senate was to represent and manage the affairs of the whole [Union,] and not to be the advocates of State interests. They ought then not to be dependent on, nor paid by the States."* This is decisive as to the *mind* of the venerable patriots who formed the constitution.

The welfare of Maine ought to be just as safe in the hands of a senator from Tennessee, as in those of her own members. A senator is the *agent* or minister of his own State, only in reference to purely local interests. About these local interests, he will procure all needed information from the proper sources; and then act freely, according to his best judgment, without any undue complacency towards his constituents, and for the manifest good of the entire confederacy.

The instructions or commands of a hundred men, composing a State legislature, are neither more valuable nor more authoritative, than similar instructions proceeding from any other hundred equally intelligent citizens. The members of a State legislature were not chosen by the people to serve as the prompters, guides or masters of the United States senators. Under the federal constitution, they perform a single function, of the same kind and in similar form, as do the electors of President and Vice-President. The senators, thenceforward, are, to all intents and purposes, just as independent of their control and supervision, as is the Executive independent of the electoral colleges. The senators, indeed, have as much right and as good reason to instruct State legislators, as

* Madison Papers, vol. iii. p. 1329.

have the latter to instruct them. They are no more responsible to a State legislature than to the emperor of China.

For treason, for official misdemeanors or malversation, for any criminal offence, a senator may be expelled, impeached or prosecuted and tried, as the law directs. Agreeably to a prevalent delusion, or perversion of constitutional principle, he is the mere creature of each successive popular State election; and may be ousted every year, or at every meeting of the legislature. Thus the Senate is rendered a less stable, a more changeable, dependent, and far less trustworthy body, than the lower house of Congress. This heresy, under the plea or pretext of the "largest democracy rule," is sapping the very foundations of the government, and preparing the way for the one man usurper of all power. The whole affair, after all, is, under another aspect, a most egregious humbug. While the people *seem* to direct, instruct and command their *so-called* servants in high places, they or the legislature are used as the mere instrument of whipping into the traces such of them as are of doubtful faith: and under a show of instruction, they present a naked *test* of their loyalty to king Party. The instruction of senators is all a farce. Concerning a thousand matters of greatest magnitude, they never exercise a thought, nor attempt interference. Their sole object is to secure absolute passive obedience to the dictation of the reigning chief—be his policy or measures what they may. And the whole lesson might always be conveyed in two words, namely: "Obey orders."

When a candidate has promised, as a condition of accepting office, to obey or resign, he is of course bound by his promise. He ought in good faith to redeem his pledge. His error lay in making the promise.

4. "Freedom of opinion." What is it? How to be exercised? Have I not a right to express my opinions on all subjects? Yes: but not the right to infringe the equal rights of other persons. I claim the right to think, believe, speculate, speak, write, publish—as I please; so that I do injury or injustice to none. I concede the same right to others. I dictate to no man. I require no one to obey my *dictum*. Let him examine and judge for himself. Remember Charles V. and his watches. He could never succeed in making any two go alike.

5. "State Rights." These are not antagonistical with the rights of the General Government. Both governments are equally the creatures of the people. This is evident from their origin, nature, province, duties, prerogatives. Why this everlasting jealousy and hostility between them? There is no more reason why a State legislature should meddle with Congress, than why the latter should meddle with the former. What would Tennessee say, were Congress to send to her legislature instructions, advice, directions or commands?

We have committed our national affairs to one class of servants, and our State affairs to another. They were designed to move and act harmoniously in different spheres: and they need never jostle or disturb one another. Each Tennessean is as much a citizen of the United States as he is of Tennessee: and he ought

to feel as deep an interest in the former as in the latter. I have been a good while a tolerably calm “looker-on here in Vienna;”^{*} and I have noticed, among other curious anomalies and inconsistencies, this in particular, namely: That the very men who clamour most loudly about State rights, are totally absorbed in national politics. They declaim, intrigue and labour only for national offices in expectancy. Every state, county, city and town election is made to turn upon national politics. They cannot choose a governor, constable, clerk or alderman, except upon the ground of national politics—nor bank directors either. Every candidate, of every degree, must publish his creed upon national politics. The people are taught to think of nothing else. The legislature, when in session or when out, do little else than discuss national politics. All our State legislatures are but so many drill-shops for the manufacture of political capital for national office-hunters. In fact, the entire machinery of every State is but a part of the great national apparatus—turned, twisted and worked exclusively for the benefit of your zealous States’ rights men; who care not a fig for the State; and whose sole ambition, after all their blustering parade, is to figure upon the national theatre and to become national rulers.

Here is ample room for democratic and whig reformation. Let our farmers and mechanics put an end to this foolery, by electing men to State offices who have, and who shall be permitted to have, no ulterior aim—no eye

* “A looker-on here in Vienna.” (Shakspeare’s *Measure for Measure*.)

upon the empty national treasury vaults—no longing after the national loaves and fishes—who will let national politics alone, and honestly devote themselves to the proper affairs of their own State. If the people do not approve the acts of the federal government, their remedy is found at the polls; namely, in the election of better men to compose the federal government. Or if they deem a law of Congress unconstitutional, let them try conclusions before the legitimate tribunal provided by the constitution. And, if not satisfied with the result, let them seek an amendment of the constitution; and thus conform it to their wishes. This is all they can do. And what more need they desire? The legislature cannot nullify a law of Congress nor repudiate its authority. Nor can they resist; except in the way of treason, rebellion or revolution.

It is abundantly humiliating to know that all our troubles and conflicts on this score have arisen from the subtle policy and daring misrepresentations of a few most abandoned reprobate traitors to the cause of democracy, who have conspired to overturn the fair fabric of constitutional government altogether, rather than fail to become its imperial masters. But for these restless wicked spirits, the people would never have exhibited a symptom of discontent upon this one point at least. For, among all the evils of a vicious government, this particular form of it has been happily escaped. Always excepting the *Broad Seal* affair of New Jersey.

6. "Political Test." "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust

under the United States." Thus reads the last clause of article 6 [section 3] of the constitution. By what authority do we prescribe a political test for the same offices? What would you say, were one of the States to ordain by its constitution or by statute, that office-holders should swear or subscribe to a religious formula, declaring man to be a mere machine—destitute of free-will or the power of voluntary action? Now you virtually, nay in terms, prescribe this very condition to your political candidates, without law and in spite of the constitution. You command them in all things to speak and act as the veriest machines imaginable. They are but as clay in the hands of the potter—to be moulded into any form, and to be used for any purpose.

7. "Independence. Liberty." These terms, of widely different import, are often confounded, or regarded as synonymous by Americans. It should never be forgotten that the revolutionary struggle was commenced simply to repel aggression, and to assert our constitutional rights as Englishmen. Our complete national independence was soon afterwards declared and eventually established. And thus resulted a very important change both of the name and form of our government. As we had never been slaves in any sense; and as, on the whole, we appear to have been tolerably loyal and contented subjects of his Britannic majesty, down to the passage by Parliament of the famous Stamp Act; experience must decide how much additional freedom has been gained by the change. National independence and civil liberty are totally different things. Russia, Austria,

France, Spain—are as independent as the United States. Mexico and South America have recently become independent also—and so has Belgium. Whether, in any of the latter, the people have acquired more personal or political liberty than they possessed before, is at least questionable. The worst species of iniquitous tyranny may be inflicted by a republican or democratic government. And a large measure of individual liberty may be enjoyed under a monarchy, and even under the most absolute despotism. Our Fourth of July and *stump* orators would do well to keep this distinction in view. They do injustice to our free-born ancestors by representing them as *slaves*: and their indiscriminate laudation of everything American is calculated to mislead and to inflate the present generation. That we are the freest, happiest, most enlightened and virtuous people on earth, may be true. Our pertinacious and everlasting reiteration of the fact, however, will not render it the more credible or the more attractive in the estimation of others. If foreigners were to judge from our newspapers, and from speeches in Congress and in the State legislatures, they would probably infer that we are about the worst governed people in the world. And assuredly, if one half of the miseries complained of, really exist, we might with good reason envy the happy lot of the Turk and the Russian.

Again: National independence does not imply or insure personal independence. It has been often remarked that Americans have less manly independence of character than is observable in some European countries. That,

though nominally and legally free, yet that *public opinion* is omnipotent over the land; that none dare oppose it, or can successfully resist it. Everybody is governed by party or sect. Hence, no man will be sustained or countenanced by numbers, who does not surrender his own mind to their control. Hence the paucity of original thinkers among us. Hence the universality of party or sectarian tyranny. Hence the general absence of moral courage. Hence the mortifying fact, that while we have innumerable talented busy politicians, we have no thorough-bred, honest, uncompromising, heroic statesmen. The latter have no field, no scope, no opportunity to exhibit or exert their faculties. There is no market—no demand for them. They are not tolerated among us. Let any high-minded patriot, with the integrity of Moses and Aristides, combined with the wisdom of a Solomon and a Franklin, attempt to pursue a straightforward course for the sole benefit of the whole republic; and he will soon find himself checked, embarrassed, silenced, by the tortuous and blighting policy of a domineering party spirit, on either hand. He can find no independent foothold—no single resting-place upon which to plant his mighty lever. He must either retire from the service altogether, or enlist as a partisan against his better judgment; and thus be compelled to give to party what was meant for mankind.

8. “The States not severally independent.” “The States never possessed the essential rights of sovereignty. These were always vested in Congress.” . . . “The States ought to be placed under the control of

the General Government; at least as much so as they formerly were under the King and British Parliament.”*

The States, at this moment, possess not a single attribute of sovereignty. They cannot declare war or make peace. They cannot commission nor receive foreign ambassadors; nor form treaties or alliances. They cannot coin money, nor emit bills of credit. They cannot maintain armies or navies. They cannot regulate their own commerce, nor impose duties on goods imported or exported.

9. “Conscience.” No public man ought ever to make his own conscience the guide, standard or test of his actions. The constitution and law of the land are to regulate his official conduct. The constitution and the laws, namely, as understood and explained by the legitimate authorities and tribunals:—not as his own little, all-sufficient, infallible, one-sided conscience may happen to dictate. He should be conscientious, indeed, in going by the established rule—not in creating the rule itself, nor in modifying it to suit his conscience. One wrong-headed, conscientiously obstinate man may do more harm in office, than a hundred rogues, who neither have, nor pretend to have, any conscience at all. Beware of men who boast of their conscience, or who plead conscience on all occasions and for all their measures. They will be very apt to enact the *Judas* or *Arnold*, the *Dominic* or *Robespierre*, sooner or later.

* Madison’s Speech before the Convention. See Yates’ Notes, etc. pp. 199, 200.

10. "My own position defined." Here I add a remark personal and apologetic. I never, on any occasion, in public or in private, abuse or denounce sects, parties, classes, communities or professions, in the gross. I censure and condemn only the wicked, dishonest and hypocritical of all sects and parties. If any such choose to apply my *hard words* to themselves or to others, it is their own affair—not mine. With the persecuting, narrow, bigoted, intolerant, exclusive *spirit* of party and sectarianism, I make no terms. For this evil spirit, I cherish no sentiment of approval or respect. Towards fair-dealing individuals of all parties and denominations, I cheerfully extend the right-hand of fellowship and good-will.

Nor do I claim to be exempt from, or above the reach of, religious or political prejudice or preference. If I am a democrat, I ought at least to be a good democratic American: and if my neighbour whig is a good whig American, why may we not live in peace and charity as Americans? If I happen, by birth or education or choice, to be a Presbyterian: need I therefore vex my brother, because, for the same or better reasons, he is a Methodist? If we are both honest Christians, why should we quarrel about names or forms or metaphysics?

Again: Though I cannot say as some have done, "I never seek and never refuse office;" I may truly say, that I have never sought office, and that office has never sought me. What I would say, were a right good lucrative or honourable public office fairly offered me, will be

better known when the critical emergency for so grievous a trial shall occur.

Our farmers and mechanics are wise men: and “a word to the wise” is “as a nail in a sure place.” (Isa. xxii. 23.)

In the mean time, that is, while the farmers and mechanics are deliberating; I proceed, as heretofore, to speak plainly of men and measures.

AMERICAN DEMOCRACY.

PART SECOND.

THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION. How to be interpreted. The meaning of the constitution is to be ascertained: 1. From the letter of the text and context. 2. From the *animus imponentis*—from the mind of the sages who framed the instrument; and from contemporaneous expositions. 3. From the acts of Congress, which have been acquiesced in by the people without question or objection—*i.e.* long usage unopposed and undisputed. 4. From decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in doubtful and litigated cases. In these several ways we arrive at the gradual development and certain interpretation of this grand national charter of delegated and therefore limited powers.

I may here add, that quite recently—within a few years past—means have been furnished whereby we may learn the intention of the original authors of the constitution, to a much greater extent than formerly. Since the publication of numerous recorded documents by order of Congress—especially the Secret Journals or Minutes of the Convention itself, and the Madisonian Papers—together with the “Secret Proceedings and Debates of the Convention,” from notes taken by the late Robert Yates of New York, who was a member of the

Convention—we are enabled to enter pretty fully into the entire train of thought and reasoning which led to the final adoption of almost every article, section and clause of the constitution. These, in connexion with the elaborate essays of Hamilton, Jay and Madison in the “Federalist,” afford a very lucid commentary, or useful guide to the impartial student of constitutional law: and he will seldom be left in the dark upon any title or subject. Such an instrument cannot be construed without aids of this description. We must be acquainted with our previous history—with the old confederation—with the precise difficulties which led to the Convention of 1787—with the various complex and conflicting interests to be therein adjusted—with the spirit of compromise and conciliation which was brought to bear upon the work—with the diverse plans submitted by eminent individuals—with the arguments urged *pro* and *con*—and lastly, with the motives and considerations which ultimately prevailed in each particular case.

Whether our distinguished jurists and learned expositors of the constitution would have decided or written otherwise than they have done, had the above-mentioned documents been published a half century earlier—is not a question for me to answer. Possibly, a different opinion, in a few instances, would have been expressed. Thus, Chancellor Kent might have varied his phraseology concerning the mode by which the constitution intended that United States senators should be chosen by the State legislatures, had he read the debates upon the subject as reported by Mr. Madison. From him it clearly

appears that the Convention had in mind nothing more than to provide or agree upon a competent body or college of electors for this single purpose—namely, of choosing senators. And that, of course, the members were to vote as individuals or *per capita*; and not that the election was to be a formal act of legislation in the technical sense, like the passage of a law. As in the latter case, one House would have a negative upon the other: and the governor, in some States, might *veto* the act of both. In either dilemma, it would be impossible to elect at all.

The Supreme Court of the Union, I have said, is the only tribunal to decide finally and in the last resort, all controversies arising under the constitution or about the constitutionality of any law of Congress. I do not mean however to intimate that every such decision must of necessity be righteous, or the best possible. It is, nevertheless, *law* for the time being, and must be obeyed. If we do not like it, we must so amend the constitution as to prevent a recurrence of the evil in future. This is a remedy or preventive always at the command of the sovereign people. And they should never permit real grievances to remain long unredressed.

The New Englanders did not approve the indefinite or perpetual embargo act of Congress under Mr. Jefferson. They pronounced the law unconstitutional.—Appealed to the courts—lost their cause—and submitted with what grace they might. Here the matter ended. Had they proceeded further, their next legal step would have been, to procure such an amendment of the constitution as should restrain Congress from laying embargoes

for more than thirty or sixty days at a time—or for some other short definite period.

I proceed to specify a case or two wherein the actual construction of the constitution has proved inequitable or injurious, with a view to illustrate the kind of ameliorating process which must be resorted to in order to avoid similar evils in future.

CASE 1ST. *Preference of the United States over other creditors.* “Congress have declared by law, that the United States were entitled to priority of payment over private creditors, in cases of insolvency, and in the distribution of the estates of deceased debtors.” (*Kent.*) And the courts have decreed accordingly. The same preference is claimed under the present Bankrupt Act;* and, no doubt, the courts will sustain the law. Here, I think, both the law and the judicial decisions are unjust—though not expressly prohibited by the constitution. In this instance, as in some others, we have followed a bad precedent—as the modern feudal sovereigns of Europe probably followed the usage of ancient Rome.† In England, as on the continent, the king is or was the sole fountain of law, honour, title and privilege. Debts to the government were debts to the king—were sued

* Passed in August, 1841; took effect February 2, 1842. Was repealed during the session of Congress of 1842–3.

† “The government was a privileged creditor under the Roman law, and entitled to priority in the payment of debts. The *cessio bonorum* was made subject to this priority. This is generally the case, in all modern bankrupt and insolvent laws. In England, the king’s claim is preferred to that of a subject, provided the king’s process was commenced before the subject had obtained judgment.” (*Kent*, vol. i. p. 247.)

for in his name—and to him was accorded precedence in this as in all other matters. But with us, the sovereign is the people. And why the people collectively, as the government, should arrogate, or be allowed, preference to the widow and orphan in all cases or in any case, is not quite apparent.

Should a rogue happen to enjoy the special confidence of the government and be largely trusted—as in the case of a collector of the customs, for example—he would, from this very circumstance, be regarded by his neighbours and the public as a very safe, solvent, responsible personage. They too would freely trust him. He fails. His assets are seized by the government. And all other creditors, however poor, weak, ignorant or helpless they may be, are excluded from all hope or chance of ever getting a dollar. Now since the courts have sustained Congress in their royal mode of expounding the constitution—in this assumption of powers not expressly granted—I would respectfully recommend to the proper authorities to set about the work of amending the constitution, so as to put an end to the injustice and oppression. I would give private creditors—certainly the poorest of them—at least an equal or *pro rata* chance with the government, if not a better. The government—that is, fifteen millions of people—could lose a few thousand dollars, with far less inconvenience or positive suffering, than many a widow or labourer would be subjected to by the loss of *ten* or *five* dollars.

CASE 2D. *The nomination and appointment of public officers by the President.* “And he [the President] shall

nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law: but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments." (*Constitution*, Article II., Sec. 2, 2.)

"The President, Vice-President and all civil officers of the United States shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors." (*Ibid.*, Sec. 4, 1.)

"The judges, both of the supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behaviour." (Art. III., Sec. 1, 1.)

"The President shall be commander-in-chief of the army and navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States." (Art. II., Sec. 2, 1.)

Thus, by the constitution, the appointment of an immensely large number of public officers is vested in the President,—“with the advice and consent of the Senate.” He nominates, but cannot absolutely or finally appoint, except by a concurrence of the Senate. No period of time or other condition for the tenure of office is specified in regard to any, except the judges, who hold during good behaviour. Nor is any mode of dismissal or ejection from office prescribed, except by impeachment. The

language and tenor of the constitution would seem to imply, that all officers appointed by or through the agency of the Senate, could be deprived of office only by the same direct agency of the Senate. Such was the exposition of the *Federalist*. (No. 77, by *Hamilton*.)

“In the act for establishing the treasury department, [1789,] the Secretary was contemplated as being removable from office by the President. The words of the act are, ‘that whenever the Secretary shall be removed from office by the President of the United States,’ etc. This amounted to a legislative construction of the constitution, and it has ever since been acquiesced in and acted upon, as of decisive authority in the case.” (*Kent*, vol. i. p. 310.) And, it may be added, in the case of all other officers. The President therefore has been considered as invested with plenary power to remove at pleasure: and he has ever since exercised the power at his own discretion—without reference to the Senate.

Now, whether this discretionary exercise of sovereign power be strictly constitutional and legal or not, I shall not pronounce. But that it is radically anti-democratic, inexpedient and dangerous, I do not hesitate to affirm. It is a power, for good or evil, with which no man in a republic ought to be invested. As the usage now is, the President may virtually appoint, and without cause assigned, may summarily dismiss, all foreign ministers and consuls; all heads of departments, with their subordinates of every degree; all postmasters and their assistants; all collectors of ports and custom-house officials; all United States marshals and attorneys; all governors

and other officers of territories; all agents, of whatever name, employed among the Indians, or about the public lands, arsenals, armories, light-houses, ship-yards, and other national establishments; all military and naval officers; and a host of others, "too tedious to mention." He also appoints all the United States judges: and he may convert even these high and holy offices into premiums for base party or personal devotion. True, he cannot turn them out. And there is always hope that a once obsequious Attorney-General or dashing Secretary of the Treasury may, when raised to the Bench, prove a second Hale or Mansfield. Or that "an honest sinner may become an honest saint."

In time of peace even, the President maintains, in absolute dependence on his will, a vast array of regular forces, occupying the most prominent positions and strongholds in every part of the nation, ready to do his bidding, and to labour for his re-election or for the advancement of his designated successor. He is also commander-in-chief of the army and navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when actually called [by himself] into the service of the Union. With such unlimited, irresponsible, regal prerogatives and powers: what security can we have for our liberties? How long may we rely on the integrity, wisdom and patriotism of the President?—with such potent engines at command, and with such dazzling temptations to their abuse ever before his eyes? Can we presume that every President will prove a Washington? Let history instruct us.

The true theory is, to deal with honest men as if they were, or might be, rogues.—To intrust no public officer with the means of doing harm, beyond the bare necessities of the public service. I doubt whether the general welfare of the republic requires that the President should appoint to any offices whatever, except *pro tempore*—certainly to very few at the utmost. While he ought to be disabled from removing them altogether—except again *pro tempore*; or until the next meeting of the Senate. Why not give to the Senate the power of both appointing to, and displacing from, office? But why grant even to the Senate the power of appointing so great a multitude of officers? Some of them—such as district judges, attorneys, marshals, postmasters—might be appointed by the legislatures of the several States in which they reside; and some again directly by the people. Why not? Can the President, or any functionary at Washington, be more competent to choose such officers for Tennessee, than the legislature or people of Tennessee? Could we not choose a United States marshal or postmaster as well as a county clerk or governor? All such officers, however chosen, would be amenable to the same laws, and subject to the same penalties for negligence or crime as at present. They would then feel that they were freemen, and might act with the independence of freemen—without dread of executive frowns and terrors.

I have long marvelled at the blindness and inconsistency of our jealous and *ultra* democracy, who sturdily contend for “the largest liberty” principle, and yet wink at this monstrous monopoly by an individual, of nearly

all the elective franchises of the nation. The people elect the members of one house of Congress directly: they elect the President, Vice-President and Senate indirectly. Beyond this, they have no agency whatever in the choice of their national rulers. A hundred thousand executive officers, more or less, are commissioned by the President—are removable at his pleasure—and are, therefore, to all intents and purposes, his humble servants. They never look to the people as the fountain of power and honour. They care not a straw about the wishes, opinions, or interests of the people.

Then as to the *Cabinet*—the heads of departments: who and what are they? By courtesy, and by intendment of the constitution, they are the President's legal advisers—his confidential state counsellors. By usage, they are the mere echo of his royal voice—as they are the mere creature of his royal prerogative. They receive orders; and construct their own opinions, that is, their advice, accordingly. They were designed, no doubt, to occupy the most dignified stations in the government; and to them are committed the most important interests of the nation. The President is presumed, or rather was presumed by the authors of the constitution, not to know all things; not to be quite omniscient; not always even a Solomon or a Pericles, a Solon or a Scipio, a Tully or a Cato, a Colbert or a Sully, a Cecil or a Pitt. He may be ignorant of finance; of military and naval affairs; of the post-office details and complexities; of international, constitutional and municipal law; and even of our foreign relations and domestic condition. What are his secre-

taries good for, if they cannot enlighten him with their superior knowledge? Each in his own proper sphere? And about matters with which, from mature study and experience, they are supposed to be perfectly familiar? And is *he* [the President] to teach and to direct *them*? Is he to dictate to a *Hamilton* or a *Gallatin* the financial policy of this mighty republic? and to turn him adrift, with as little ceremony as he would a footman, if he hesitate to yield up his own judgment to official ignorance, obstinacy, party passion, proscriptive vengeance, or conscientious, impracticable, mulish stupidity? Why should the members of a cabinet be expected to agree with one another or with the President upon all subjects or upon any subject? If each is master of his own profession, and if he discharge his duty ably, diligently, faithfully: what more do you ask of him? The President is not bound by his opinion or advice upon matters of general policy, nor even upon those of his own department. Suppose each were to deliver a different opinion upon an important question submitted to their consideration. The President may do as Washington did, receive their opinions kindly, weigh them thoroughly, make up his own independently, and decide differently from them all at last; and differently too from what would have been his decision, without their aid and apparently conflicting counsels. To talk of constitutional advisers, who dare not speak their own thoughts or give an honest opinion, who are the mere passive recipients of a master's arbitrary mandates, is a contradiction, a farce, a perversion of the whole order of the constitution, and

of all democratic common sense. No high-minded man will ever consent to be made a slave like this. He will indignantly throw up his commission, return home, and plough his own cornfield, rather than wear the livery and the chains of any despot upon the throne or of his prompter from behind it!

The heads of departments ought to be as independent of the President, as he is of them—so far, at least, as respects official conduct. For this, each should be directly and individually responsible to the laws and proper tribunals.

Even the sovereign of Great Britain cannot choose, or keep in office, a ministry whom the people, by their Commons, do not like. *There* the will of the people is paramount, and it always prevails. An unpopular minister, that is, a minister unsupported by the people in Parliament assembled, is obliged forthwith to resign. And the king or queen is compelled to commission the people's favourite, however disagreeable or even odious to majesty he may be. *Here* the President may do as he pleases. He appoints whom the people reject; and rejects or removes whom the people honour and prefer. Let the democracy speedily amend the constitution or the law or both; or there will not be found a shadow of real democracy in the land.

Our farmers and mechanics would do well to scrutinize the tendency of all our grand political movements, as well as the peculiar features and portentous aspect which the Federal Government, in the lapse of years and by insensible degrees, has been made to assume. It is already

more monarchical than that of England—after which we copied. With us, the people elect but a single branch of the national legislature; and *that* has ceased to represent the people's wishes; is controlled by the executive; and, at best, possesses comparatively small powers. While in England, the House of Commons, the people's representative in fact as well as in name, is omnipotent. Its strong arm may be felt by the throne, the church and the aristocracy. Kings and lords and prelates bow to its supremacy. It holds fast the purse of the empire. Royalty cannot extract from it a shilling without its formal sanction. The young queen could not command a "corporal's guard" about her palace or a sloop-of-war upon the ocean, were the Commons to withhold the customary supplies, or fail to enact the annual money bills. This complete, unrestricted, absolute, unquestioned control of the national purse or treasury by the Commons, is a far more effective and perfect guarantee of English liberty, than is furnished by all our constitutions, State and national, in behalf of American liberty.

That I may be neither misunderstood nor misrepresented, I here take occasion to declare: that I would prefer such a constitutional government as our fathers honestly designed to institute, above every other and all others in the world. Were it now, what they intended to make it, I would say, *esto perpetua!* May it continue forever, unchanged and unchangeable!

But since, under the deceptive banner of a spurious democracy, which is ever promising but never performing, the most alarming innovations upon the original

frame-work of the government are in progress, I warn the people to be on their guard. And if they will insist on what they deem a wider, larger, more equable democracy; let them be just to themselves, to their cause, to their avowed principles. Let them take the power into their own hands, and exercise it for their own benefit; instead of surrendering more and more of it to the factious demagogue, who is eternally prating about democracy, about the miseries of the poor, about the oppression of the working-classes, about hard times; and about the urgent need of reform, which can be effected only through his own or his master's democratic agrarian policy, to be tried when he or they shall be duly installed into office. While, with all this fair speech and large pretension, he is covertly aiming to usurp or to help another to usurp, or to seize upon, the whole State—the entire sovereignty—the executive supremacy over the legislature, the judiciary, the military, the sword, the purse, war and peace, upon the land and upon the ocean!

These two instances of early departure from the spirit, if not from the letter, of the constitution, and sustained by law and usage—namely, 1. Preference of the United States over all other creditors, and 2. Right of the President to remove from office—must suffice as examples and illustrations under this particular head.

Strict and liberal interpreters of the constitution.

On the general subject of reading or construing the constitution, it is known that, from the beginning, there have existed among us two schools or sects. 1. *Strict* or *literal* interpreters—who affect to go by the record; and

who deny to Congress all powers not expressly granted. 2. *Liberal* or comprehensive or practical interpreters—who *profess* to be fair and candid, honest and judicious, in seeking to promote the national welfare; and who maintain that Congress may exercise a discretionary legislation for the public good in matters not positively forbidden. The *first* have the air and aspect of orthodoxy. They appear before the people as erect, “perpendicular,” unyielding, indomitable constitutionalists—as a self-sacrificing, saintly, consecrated band of zealous devotees, perhaps of martyrs even, to the holy cause of liberty and the rights of man. The *second* look less sternly conscientious; are thought to be somewhat latitudinarian, too free and easy, rather lax, licentious or heretical in their constitutional views; and, of course, like other heretics, they may be rendered exceedingly obnoxious to public censure and hatred: and the hue and cry may be raised against them, with or without reason.*

Here again, I have observed that the most rigid of “the straitest sect,” whenever they get into high places, seem to acquire a sudden enlargement of their political vision and constitutional prowess: are ready to leap over all *wordy* barriers, and to construe the text with a freedom quite edifying to the timid *liberalists*, who would never have adventured half so far under any circum-

* *The liberal school* is at present reproachfully styled the *federal* party—or *federalists*. The *strict*, for a time, gloried in the name *republican*. They now choose to be called *democrats*. By their opponents, they are dubbed *loco-focos*. The *whigs* claim to be honest, patriotic, constitutional Americans.

stances. Thus, Mr. Jefferson advanced *per saltum* a thousand leagues beyond either of his reputed liberal or federal predecessors. He, too, the very father, prince, apostle and high-priest of modern democracy! He was the opposer of the constitution at the outset, because it was not sufficiently democratic. The champion of State rights. The advocate of the narrowest possible construction of the constitution, and of the most limited action of the general government. He was also an eloquent preacher of economy, retrenchment, moderate salaries, light taxes, toleration of all sorts of opinion, freedom of speech and of the press, one-term presidency, independence of office-holders, and other such like goodly doctrines—which are always acceptable to the people. But no sooner upon the throne—than his eyes were opened! He then clearly perceived that the constitution meant whatever he should understand it to mean; that is, whatever he desired, or might happen to desire in future. He created a new cabinet of course. He removed also, from subordinate offices, sundry able and upright men in various sections of the country. In the affair of removals, however, it must be acknowledged that he acted with great forbearance compared with the correspondent course of some of his successors. His profession of a purer democratic creed than the federalists, flattered the people: and they were delighted with every demonstration of executive boldness; because they regarded it as the infliction of just punishment or vengeance upon their own worst enemies and oppressors.

He contrived to get rid of some two dozen [twenty-

six] circuit judges,* by procuring a repeal of the law by which they had been recently appointed. He stayed process against persons arraigned under the sedition law; and he pardoned all persons convicted under that and the alien law; because he believed both laws to be unconstitutional. Salaries were raised twenty per cent.—except those of the judges, who were always in bad odour with him, because they could not be broken or trained so as to work kindly in his big democratic team. Hence he earnestly sought to render them as dependent on the executive nod as were all other public servants. But in this pretty little democratic *ruse* or project for the especial benefit and divertisement of the dear people, he most unaccountably failed—whether through lack of courage, or perseverance, or tact, or “conscience,” history has not explained. His purchase of Louisiana—the best act or most fortunate accident of his administration—was, according to his own statement, *extra* constitutional: as would have been that of Florida, which he attempted. His naval and commercial policy; embargoes, non-importation and non-intercourse acts; gun-boats; and such like schemes and doings, exhibited a series which might well be characterized as *extra* or *ultra* or *anti*-constitutional—agreeably to his own standard of *strict* construction.

He was, however, on the whole perhaps a rather safe, reliable, conservative sort of a politician: and we are thankful that he did so little damage, when he might have done so much. He was not a revolutionist. He was not a rash, reckless, furious innovator or reformer.

* See Memoirs of Aaron Burr, vol. ii. p. 171.

He did not attempt even a modification of the financial policy, which was coeval with the new government, of which Hamilton was the author and he the antagonist, when both were members of the first presidential cabinet. And this is glory enough, even for a Jefferson. Let us honour his memory. He followed exactly in the footsteps of his illustrious predecessors, in this one grand essential. He adhered to the true faith in regard to finance: and therefore could not contrive to steer the gallant ship of State very far out of the right course. It is impossible to ruin a country, or greatly to embarrass and distress it, when its finances are wisely managed. On the other hand, administer these badly, and all is confusion, darkness, rascality and desperation. Our country has not enjoyed a day of peaceful repose or brilliant prosperity, except when and while the financial system which our Washington approved, has prevailed!

True, Mr. Jefferson's petty, "terrapin," defensive, do-nothing experiments in the gun-boat and anti-commercial line, were rather onerous and expensive. They were designed to prevent war; but in fact cost more than the war itself, which they did not prevent; and which they probably provoked and accelerated.

At a later period, Mr. Jefferson seems, according to his biographer, Professor Tucker, to have very frankly acknowledged that: the constitution may admit of a *liberal* or of a *strict* construction, just as the welfare of the country demands. This is, undoubtedly, the only wise, fair, equitable, legitimate principle of interpreta-

tion. When the *letter* of the text fails as a guide, we must go by the *spirit* of the context—with a single eye to the public good. Because it may be safely assumed that the sensible architects of the constitution did not intend to prevent the future adoption of any measure evidently required by the general welfare; except when explicitly ordained otherwise or to the contrary.

Any measure, therefore, which can be shown to be beneficial to the whole people and detrimental to none, and which is not in terms prohibited in the constitution, may and ought to be sustained as constitutional.

Let us try the *principle* in practice. The United States Bank and internal improvements may serve as examples for the purpose.

1. *United States Bank.* With the first President, Cabinet and Congress, the main inquiry would be, whether, on the whole, the incorporation of a United States Bank would prove the wisest, safest, best financial scheme that could be devised, in the actual circumstances of the country. Not merely whether, according to a strictly literal and technical construction of the constitution, they possessed the *power* to charter a bank. They had been [some twenty of them] members of the convention which formed the constitution, and had participated largely in the discussion of this very subject. They knew the precise reasons which induced them to pass it altogether *sub silentio*, or without positive provision for the emergency. They understood the matter very well. They realized the difficulties and delicacy of their novel position. They felt that the *experimentum crucis* was to be made. That

they had a critical and responsible duty to perform. Nor did they shrink from the task. The credit of the young republic was at stake—was in fact to be created out of absolute chaos. They were, by their first acts, to establish the meaning, the true reading, the correct interpretation, the practical application of the written constitution. Whatever course they pursued in regard to a bank, they took for granted would ever after be deemed constitutional; unless judicially condemned by the highest constitutional authority. Hence their extreme caution, prudence, sagacity and judgment, in examining and weighing reasons on either side, in all their bearings and results; in order to ascertain the system or policy which would be likely to work well; which would be expedient and beneficial for the nation then, and probably in all future time. Having deliberately made up their mind, as to the expediency, usefulness and necessity of such a fiscal agent, they declared it constitutional, by giving it existence. And the courts have confirmed their act.

That the government has the right—the abstract right—to create a corporation, cannot be doubted. It is an inherent, essential, inalienable, indefeasible attribute of sovereignty. It was no more necessary to insert it in the constitution, than it was to specify the power to acquire additional territory, either by conquest or purchase. Every nation has the right. No nation could be sovereign and independent without it. Mr. Jefferson need never have hesitated, on this ground, about the purchase of Louisiana. If it might have been acquired by arms—at any cost of gold and blood—*a fortiori* might

it be obtained peaceably, cheaply and without the sacrifice or hazard of a single life. So if, in levying taxes, duties, imposts, *equally* over the whole Union, and in order to establish a uniform currency throughout the land, a bank should be found the cheapest and best agency, or the only agency, then it follows that a bank ought to be established.*

It has, moreover, been decided to be constitutional by the Supreme Court—by all the Presidents—by every Congress—by all the States—and by the whole people—for the space of some forty years at least. No bill to establish a bank was ever rejected by Congress, simply because it was believed to be unconstitutional. Nor has such a bill been vetoed by any President exclusively on that ground—unless we regard the present executive as the sole exception. He has set up a new rule, which, if generally adopted, will supersede all written codes and all judicial decisions: namely, *The Presidential Conscience*, for the time being!

Whether, therefore, a national bank be constitutional, is no longer an open or debatable question. And I have adverted to the case, to show how such questions are to be determined, settled and put at rest forever.

But in reference to a United States Bank, whatever may have been urged in favour of the first and second

*“but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.” (*Const.*, Art. I., Sec. 8, 1.)

5. “To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin,” * * *

No State shall “emit bills of credit.” (Art. I., Sec. 10, 1.)

institutions, it is *now* and may be hereafter, a fair, open, debatable question: whether such a bank, or whether any bank, be necessary, useful or expedient? The condition of the country may differ widely at different periods. Experience may have taught or may yet teach us new lessons. Possibly we can do better. Very well.—Here is legitimate scope for reasoning and for diversity of opinions. The constitutional controversy ought to be dismissed by both whigs and democrats as obsolete and irrelevant. They might as well discuss and quarrel about the constitutional right of erecting forts or building steam frigates.

In this connexion, I have not intended to say a word for or against a new United States Bank of any description whatever. I am no advocate of either *State* or *Stock* Banks—as they have hitherto been constructed and managed all over the land. That a *paper currency*, nevertheless, of some kind, is indispensable, both to the government and to the people, I entertain the deepest conviction. My reasons will be assigned in another place.

2. *Internal Improvements.* We have seen how the constitution was construed in the case of a bank corporation. The same or a similar process was pursued in relation to “internal improvements” by the general government; as also in regard to the policy of protecting our *home* or domestic industry. In these and other analogous cases, Congress interpreted the constitution liberally, and in accordance with their views of the substantial and paramount welfare of the people. Whether wise or unwise,

right or wrong, in their plans and enactments—is not now the question. Did they violate the constitution? I think not. A good road, for instance, is always a good thing—wherever needed or by whomsoever made. Gunboats were useless, and have perished.—The road endures, and is available. Congress annually waste hundreds of thousands in idle disputes about “heads and tails:” the road remains for them and their betters to travel home upon and back again at pleasure. Millions are expended on visionary experiments and projects, on showy edifices, forts, castles, branch-mints, Indian wars, political favourites, sinecure offices, and all sorts of knaves, fools and fooleries: while the good old road, if kept in repair, reminds us of our “penny worth” amid the general wreck and ruin; and is, at present, about all that we have to show for some two hundred millions which have disappeared, as if by the touch of a “magician’s wand!”* Could our gold-worshippers at Washington but discover the philosopher’s stone, or get possession of Aladdin’s lamp; we, the “workies,” might take a long quiet nap, without dread of sheriff or bumbailiff; and without being haunted by the ghostly agents and officious factotums of a regular, constitutional, debt-repudiating, *bankruptcy* deliverance.

By-the-way, if the government be an “abstraction,” would it not be well to let it live upon abstractions?

* The act for the construction of a national road from Cumberland in Maryland, to the State of Ohio, was passed March 24, 1806, in Congress, by a vote of 66 to 50: under the “Simon pure” democratic reign of the “great” and infallible Jefferson! (See *Tucker*, vol. ii. p. 199.)

If “the government has enough to do to take care of itself”—why, then, to be sure, let it work *per se*; without plaguing the people or demanding their support.

To explain the difference between a fair construction of the constitution, and a direct palpable violation of its letter, I select a specimen or two, as illustrations.

1. “No title of nobility shall be granted by the United States.” (Art. I., Sec. 9, 7.) Now were a law to be duly passed, creating the noble orders which obtain in England, and authorizing the President to confer rank and titles at his pleasure; and were the courts to pronounce the law valid and constitutional: everybody, capable of reading, would instantly perceive the glaring imposition, and be ready to exclaim that the constitution had been virtually annulled. Still, if the whole people chose to abide the consequences, we might soon behold our staunch democratic and whig popular brawlers, converted into respectable courtly Lords and Dukes; and sporting stars, garters, coronets, and all other fantastic and heraldic emblazonry—after the most approved legitimate transatlantic models.

2. Again, says Article I., Section 1, of the constitution: “All legislative powers herein granted, shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.”—Human language could not be plainer, more precise, more explicit, more intelligible, or more definite. Yet we have lived to see the day, when some of the most tenacious professors of the severest *literal* sect boldly

proclaim that the Executive is a co-ordinate* branch—an integral efficient part—of the national legislature. Merely because he can, in a certain way, arrest its action and prevent the passage of a law. Will this audacious usurpation be sustained, or tamely submitted to, by our honest democracy, in the very teeth of the letter and manifest intendment of the entire constitution?

Might not the Judiciary set up a still more specious claim, to be considered as part and parcel of the legislature also? Because the Supreme Court possesses the power to pronounce finally and decisively upon the constitutionality of all its acts? The Judges, I think, would beat the President in logic, at least, upon this argument. Between them, *i.e.* the Executive and the Judiciary, Congress would soon have little to do, except to obey orders, and receive their *per diem*.

In the case of removals from office by the President, we have seen how the practice crept in, against the manifest import of the constitution and almost without law: and we have seen, or may see, from a paper in the “Federalist,” written by Mr. Hamilton, how that *ultra* champion of monarchy, as his revilers style him, expounded the constitution, to mean that the President had no such power, and that removals could be effected only by consent or vote of the Senate.† Still, not one of our strait-

* Mr. Jefferson speaks of the executive as a co-ordinate branch. (*Tucker*, vol. ii. p. 167.) Again: . . . “And because he himself, being a part of the legislature, shares in the responsibility of all their acts.” (*Tucker*, vol. ii. pp. 195–96.)

† “The consent of the Senate (says Hamilton in No. 77 of the *Federalist*) would be necessary to displace as well as to appoint;” and he

laced democratic Presidents has ever attempted to break the custom, and get back to the constitution. They have found it extremely convenient to continue a practice, which Hamilton condemned; and which they, in fact, were the first to turn to much account. No federalist ever dreamt of being a third, or a half, or the totality of the law-making power of the Union.

Will the people be forever humbugged by names? Will they tolerate the most barefaced contradictions and inconsistencies, and permit violence to be offered to the sacred charter of their liberties, by any *Cæsar* or *Clodius*, *Burr* or *Dorr*, who may condescend to wear the garb and utter the speech of democracy?

These are the men who strain at gnats, and swallow camels.* They denounced the elder Adams as a fed-

goes on to observe, that "those who can best estimate the value of a steady administration, will be most disposed to prize a provision which connects the official existence of public men with the approbation or disapprobation of that body, which, from the great permanency of its own composition, will in all probability be less subject to inconstancy than any other member of the government." But the construction (says Kent) which was given to the constitution by Congress, after great consideration and discussion, was different. In the act for establishing the treasury department, [September 2, 1789,] the Secretary was contemplated as being removable from office by the President. The words of the act are, "That whenever the Secretary shall be removed from office by the President of the United States," etc. This amounted to a legislative construction of the constitution, and it has ever since been acquiesced in and acted upon, as of decisive authority in the case. (*Kent*, vol. i. pp. 309-10.)

* They compel the people to swallow the *camels*. They get up a tremendous uproar about a *feather*, it may be—"a billiard table," "a light-house in the skies," "an ebony and topaz toast," "a Panama mission," the expense of an *unfurnished* "East room," "a national

eralist and British tory, on account of the stamp act, "gag law," and a few other trifles, which were made to assume a "raw head and bloody bones" aspect before the people. Of these measures, by-the-way, however odious they rendered him and his administration, he was neither the author nor the adviser. His whole sin consisted in not interfering: in suffering a majority to decide. He was too honest a democrat to *veto* the sedition and alien laws, or any laws enacted by Congress, simply because he had not suggested them or did not like them. He did not feel *big* enough, or "conscientious" enough, to declare that the people's representatives were asses and noodles; and therefore deserved a cool reprimand in the shape of an "I forbid:" so get about your business, and tell the silly multitude who sent you here, that, "I know better."

university" *in posse*, etc. And when the people are sufficiently exasperated to do battle against the *gnats*, then begins the work of *camel-eating* in good earnest. A government of *twelve* millions a year, was unbearable: another, of *thirty* millions, was capital! The sedition law was a terrible affair: while "the banishment to Siberia" in mid-winter of twenty thousand public servants without even the shadow of a trial, was but a *camel*; and the people could easily swallow it: and they did swallow it. Thus it has always been. *Abimelech* borrowed a little money from the sacred treasury, "wherewith he hired vain and light persons, who followed him," and soon helped him to *borrow* the rest. (Judges, ix. 4.) "So *Absalom* stole the hearts of the men of Israel," by all sorts of democratic blandishments: and they paid dearly, as usual, for their credulity. (2 Sam. xv. 6.) "*Jeroboam* the son of *Nebat*, who made Israel to sin," (1 Kings, xvi. 26,) set an example of acting agreeably "to his own understanding of the constitution;" which was so well imitated by his successors, that the Ten Tribes began presently to doubt whether they had any constitution, beside the royal pleasure: and they had none!

Now, if Mr. Adams had, by royal edict or imperial *ukase*, promulgated the stamp, sedition and alien laws, without even the knowledge of Congress, he would not have perpetrated a more high-handed contempt of constitutional authority, or of the people's representatives, than has since been witnessed under other forms and names *democratic*. A President may as well make the law at once; as to be allowed to prevent the passage of any law which he dislikes. The first would be much the cheaper and more eligible plan. I vote for it, as the preferable alternative.

But as we do not yet despair of the Republic: and as I before intimated that some amendments to the constitution were desirable, or rather had become indispensable, in order to maintain among us a pure democracy in future—I proceed to specify two or three.

1. The President to be elected for one term only: and the shorter the better.
2. The executive *veto* to be abolished altogether.
3. Majorities in either House of Congress, and everywhere, to decide all questions. *Two-thirds* never. [Except, possibly, in cases of impeachment of high officers, and the expulsion of members.]
4. The President to have no power to remove from office: [he may suspend for a time:] and very little or none in the appointment of officers.
5. In case of the President's death within a year, let the same electoral colleges choose his successor, in such manner as shall be prescribed. Indeed, I see no good reason why they should not be authorized to fill any vacancy which might occur during the presidential term. Why not? They were

chosen by the people to express their will for the next ensuing four years. I suggest this, upon the supposition that the present mode is to be continued. It would be more democratic to dispense with *electors* altogether, and allow the people to vote directly for the President and Vice-President.

1. The President ought to be elected for a single term or period. *One* only—fixed and definite. Let it be *four* years, if you please: though three or two would be better. But let no man ever be eligible for more than one term. Thus taught Mr. Jefferson; and *amen* has been responded by every democrat, until recently; though not one has ever practised accordingly. In *Texas*, one term of three years is established by the constitution. The party elected being ineligible until after an interval of three years. He should have been declared ineligible forever.

Roman consuls held office one year. They were not re-eligible until after the expiration of ten years. "It was required that every candidate for the consulship should be forty-three years of age, called *legitimum tempus*." He would, of course, be fifty-four when a candidate for a second time: sixty-five for a third: and seventy-six or seventy-seven before he could complete a four years' reign. So long as these two rules were rigidly observed, the Roman constitution was safe. A *Roman policy* was steadily pursued by them all. There was no individual *consular* experimental policy. Hence the vigorous growth and prosperity of the republic. No Roman consul had any favourite personal scheme of ambition or vanity to execute or attempt. Or if he had, no

time was allowed him to mature it. He could do no more than go forward in the prescribed national course, and earn fame and reputation by achieving the utmost possible for the public weal and glory during his brief official year. In like manner, we ought to have an AMERICAN POLICY: not a *Presidential*—a *Jeffersonian*, a *Van Buren*, a *Tyler*, a *Calhoun*, or a *Clay* policy; requiring some eight or a dozen years to carry it out. That is, to ascertain by the trial, whether it will answer, or whether it is practicable. Thus keeping the country in perpetual suspense and excitement. Nothing settled. Always in a transition state. Ever making experiments. Giving to the constitution, now a *liberal*, now a *strict*, now an *ultra* construction. Until it comes to mean anything or nothing; at the will of a dictator. Let the farmers and mechanics put *their* omnipotent *veto* upon such follies and abuses. Let *them* speak: and their servants must obey. Washington's policy was the true American policy. Let us, like sensible well-whipped children, return to it, and adhere to it, for the next thousand generations.

2. Abrogate the *veto* prerogative altogether. The Roman tribunitial *veto* was instituted to check the arbitrary encroachments of the Patrician order. It never answered any good purpose. It eventually became a principal engine in the hands of the demagogue, and hastened the consummation of the military despotism of the Cæsars. The *liberum veto*, exercised severally by the Polish grandees, in the election of a king, proved the immediate cause of infinite dissensions and tumults;

and ultimately prostrated the national spirit and government, and led to a partition of the kingdom by the neighbouring powers. We have borrowed the *veto* from neither of these. We copied again from England: as she had done from the feudal sovereigns of the middle ages. Among these it was a personal right: that is, it attached to the person of the *liege*—of the actual emperor, king, duke, or acknowledged chieftain. It now appertains to the *crown*. It is a *royal* prerogative; and, in modern Europe, is seldom exerted: in England, never! I object to it, because it is anti-republican, anti-democratic, unnecessary, never beneficial, always liable to abuse; and may be so exercised as to render nugatory the entire action of the legislature.

I say nothing of the past. How much good the *veto* may have hitherto effected, I leave others to calculate. Assuredly, it is not necessary to a democracy. We have no hereditary or privileged nobility or patrician aristocracy, for the *Plebs* to struggle against. The President is the very man, above all others, the most to be feared. He is the only *power* in the State which can infringe upon or demolish our liberties. If we cannot trust our three hundred chosen representatives to make laws both for him and us: what can they be good for? Is it not enough that he should execute the laws, without any agency in their enactment?

Our President is more powerful and less responsible than any European constitutional monarch whatever. He is in fact an *absolute* monarch, for the time being. By the *veto*, he can, in the present state of parties, arrest

all legislation. He can even bring to terms or to humiliating submission to his will, a Congress, where both parties are hostile to him and to his measures. He can refuse to nominate candidates for office. Or he can appoint those whom the Senate rejects—after its adjournment. At best or worst, no man can get an office, except through his special favour. Thus by patronage, by command of the army and navy, by possession or control of the treasury, by party management, and by sundry other means and appliances, he is above the reach of the people, of the constitution and the laws. He is not dependent even for his salary. A vote of supplies by the Commons, is not necessary *here*, as it is in England.

A man may become President, and therefore our *master*, not only without a vote of the people, but against their wishes. Thus *Burr* might have been elected by Congress in preference to *Jefferson*: though not a vote of the people or of the *electors* had been given with such intent. Again, had *Jefferson* died during his first official term, *Burr* would have been President of course, though *then* actually odious to all parties. Both President and Vice-President may die: then succeeds the President *pro tempore* of the Senate: after him, the Speaker of the lower House; either of whom may be wholly unacceptable to the people. Shall such an “accidency” be clothed with the tremendous *veto*?

Ought the President to sign a bill which he believes or asserts to be unconstitutional? He ought not; is the general reply. If this be sound logic, then is it conclu-

sive against allowing him any discretion in the matter. I say that the President's belief, opinion, judgment, conscience, have nothing to do with any principle, rule, law, or system, already decided and established by the Supreme Court to be constitutional. *His* "conscience" is not the test or criterion for a great nation to go by. Deliver him speedily from the temptation, by amending the constitution, and shutting him out of the legislative chambers altogether.

3. Majorities in either house of Congress ought to decide all questions which come before them. The constitution should be altered in those cases where two-thirds are required. [Excepting, perhaps, cases of impeachment, and expulsion of members.] Much evil has arisen in our legislative bodies, both State and national, where the *two-thirds* rule obtains. Thus, two-thirds of the senators must concur with the President in the ratification of a treaty. So that the ablest achievement of our diplomacy may be defeated by a single vote. "Jay's treaty," one of the most judicious ever formed, though egregiously misrepresented and fiercely denounced at the time, was ratified at last by a majority of one. Thus also, two-thirds in each house are necessary to pass a law *vetoed* by the President. I shall not enlarge upon this item, though I deem it highly important. To require two-thirds instead of a numerical majority, is anti-democratic; and may often obstruct the known will and best interests of the people. Let the majority rule: that is, determine who shall rule, and what the rule shall be.

NOTES.

Royal interference with legislation. In 1783, during the pendency of Fox's famous India bill, it was reported and believed, that the king, in a private audience, had given Lord Temple a note, written in his own hand, stating, "that his majesty would deem those who voted for the bill not only not his friends, but his enemies: and that, if Lord Temple could put this in still stronger words, he had full authority to do so."

"On the very same evening the Commons, on the motion of Mr. Baker, took into consideration the rumour about Lord Temple and the king's strong note, and voted the two following resolutions:—

1. "That it is now necessary to declare that, to report any opinion, or pretended opinion, of his majesty, upon any bill, or other proceeding, depending in either House of Parliament, with a view to influence the votes of the members, is a high crime and misdemeanor, derogatory to the honour of the crown, a breach of the fundamental privileges of Parliament, and subversive of the constitution of this country.

2. "That this House will, on Monday next, resolve itself into a committee of the whole House, to consider the state of the nation." (*Pictorial England*, No. 53, p. 503.)

Sedition Law. "He [Mr. Jefferson] justified himself for the liberation of the individual alluded to, in common with all others punished under the sedition law, because he considered that law 'a nullity as absolute and palpable, as if Congress had ordered us to fall down and worship a golden image.'" (*Tucker's Life of Jefferson*, vol. ii. p. 166. Letter to Mrs. Adams.)

Repeal of the law, creating twenty-four new courts. (*Ibid.*, vol. ii. pp. 113, 114.)

Strict Construction. "These arguments prevailed with the republican party, who now found that the very strict construction of the constitution for which they had contended when in the opposition, was not suited to them when in the exercise of power; and which, if pushed to that extreme of nicety which some affected, would often defeat the main purposes for which the constitution was established." Thus writes *Tucker*, in relating the arguments *pro* and *con* respecting the Louisiana treaty. [Adopted in Senate by 24 to 7. In lower house by 90 to 25.] (*Tucker*, vol. ii. p. 155.)

Louisiana. In reference to the purchase of Louisiana, Mr. Jefferson admitted or rather declared that the executive "have done an act beyond the constitution." (*Tucker*, vol. ii. p. 147.)

The federalists charged Mr. Jefferson and his friends, who had been advocates for a strict interpretation of the constitution, with being "ultra latitudinarian in construing it when it suited their purpose." . . . (*Tucker*, vol. ii. p. 112.)

Removal of Judges. "A proposition, which had been made at the preceding session, [1805,] to amend the constitution so that any judge of a federal court might be removed by the President, on the joint application of the two houses of Congress, was renewed at the present session, [1806,] and after the disagreement to the proposition in committee of the whole, the motion to postpone it indefinitely was rejected by a large majority." Nothing more was attempted. (*Tucker*, vol. ii. p. 200.)

Dependence of Judges. (*Ibid.*, pp. 376, 377.)

"He denies that the judges have any right to decide constitutional questions for the Executive, more than the Executive has to decide for them." (*Tucker*, vol. ii. p. 167.)

Mr. Jefferson's opinion about the interference of the officers of the federal government in the elections, in his reply to a letter on the subject from Governor McKean of Pennsylvania, dated February 2, 1801, just before he entered upon the duties of President:—

"Mr. Jefferson expresses a principle which he afterwards acted on, that 'interferences with elections, whether of the State or General Government, by officers of the latter, should be deemed causes of removal; because the constitutional remedy by the elective principle becomes nothing, if it may be smothered by the enormous patronage of the general government.'"

Again, in a letter to Mr. Gerry, February, 1801, he says: "The right of opinion shall suffer no invasion from me. Those who have acted well have nothing to fear, however they may have differed from me in opinion: those who have done ill, however, have nothing to hope; nor shall I fail to do justice, lest it should be ascribed to that difference of opinion." (*Tucker's Life of Jefferson*, vol. ii. pp. 98, 167.)

"Both of our political parties, at least the honest part of them, agree conscientiously in the same object, the public good; but they differ essentially in what they deem the means of promoting that good." (Letter to Mrs. Adams. *Tucker*, vol. ii. p. 167.)

See *Madison Papers*, vol. iii. pp. 1576, 1577. "Mr. Madison suggested an enlargement of the motion, [then *sub judice*,] into a power 'to grant charters of incorporation where the interest of the United States might require, and the legislative provisions of individual States

may be incompetent.’” “Mr. [Rufus] King thought the power unnecessary.” “Mr. Wilson: It is necessary to prevent a *State* from obstructing the *general* welfare.” In reply, “Mr. King: The States will be prejudiced and divided into parties by it. In Philadelphia and New York, it will be referred to the establishment of a bank, which has been a subject of contention in those cities. In other places it will be referred to mercantile monopolies.” In reply, Mr. Wilson again: “As to banks, he did not think with Mr. King, that the power in that point of view would excite the prejudices and parties apprehended. As to mercantile monopolies, they are already included in the power to regulate trade.”

It would seem that Mr. Madison’s motion failed, from a conviction that Congress would possess the power without any explicit grant—if not explicitly denied.

Mr. King probably alluded to the commercial rivalry existing between Philadelphia and New York: and to the apprehensions of the latter lest the former should be preferred as the site of any contemplated national bank.

Again: “Mr. Madison and Mr. Pinckney moved to insert, in the list of powers vested in Congress, a power ‘to establish an University, in which no preferences or distinctions should be allowed on account of religion.’” “Mr. Wilson supported the motion.” “Mr. Gouverneur Morris: It is not necessary. The exclusive power at the seat of government will reach the object.” This case is introduced to illustrate the mode of arguing and disposing of such and similar questions. They seem to have assumed that the *power* would vest in Congress, when not withheld or refused. See also *Madison Papers*, vol. iii. pp. 1343–46, for debates about bills of credit. “Mr. G. Morris moved to strike out, ‘and emit bills on the credit of the United States.’” “Mr. Langdon had rather reject the whole plan, than retain the three words, ‘and emit bills.’” Nine States voted to strike out. Two, not.

Mr. Elbridge Gerry declared, when the proposition to charter the United States Bank was before Congress, “that Congress had as perfect a right to incorporate a bank as to adjourn from day to day.” He had been a member of the Convention, and was a member of Congress from 1789 to 1793. He was a Jeffersonian democrat of the *first water*.

I more than doubt the wisdom or expediency of ever creating a corporation by either the General or State Governments, for the mere purpose of pecuniary emolument to individuals. Experience has de-

monstrated that this species of legalized monopoly is ever liable to the grossest abuses. It is odious, partial, fraudulent, oppressive, irresponsible, anti-democratic. It has proved delusive and ruinous to honest confiding stockholders; and is auspicious only to gambling, adventurous, reckless speculators. Let our existing banks run out their appointed course—or run away, as many of them have done and are doing. And let us never grant another charter for money-making—or for swindling. Leave the occupation of banking, as you do that of pin-making, to the enterprise, prudence, skill, inclination and responsibility of individuals—*here*, in this free Republic, as it is, and ever has been, in all other countries. An act of incorporation for the benefit of private or associated money-lenders, is no more necessary or proper, than would be a similar act for mercantile or mechanical firms or copartnerships.

Who were the popularity hunters and agitators in the army of the revolution? *Conway, Gates*, etc. Who, at the close of the war, plotted treason among the officers; and tempted Washington with the insidious offer of a crown, only to secure its reversion to the aching head of a very different individual? Who wrote the famous “Newburgh letters?” Who sought to inflame the minds of the unpaid soldiery to sedition, insurrection, rebellion?—to the establishment of a military reign under such chief as they might select? Not Hamilton, Knox, Greene, Schuyler, Putnam.....General *John Armstrong* [then a Major] has told us. He, too, was a popular democrat *then*, and thenceforth, to the end of the chapter. Colonel *Burr* was among the earliest and most cherished leaders of the democracy; and for several years was second only to Jefferson. And the “hero of *Chepachet*” [*Dorr*] is decidedly the greatest democratic *lion* of the day, [1842.]

No man can be certain, before trial, what he will become when in office. “And Hazael said, But what! is thy servant a dog, that he should do this great thing? And Elisha answered, The Lord hath showed me that thou shalt be king over Syria.” (2 Kings, viii. 13.)

Old Federalism. What is it? Whence did it spring? What was the origin of the *name*? How did Washington administer the government? How did Adams? Why denounce *Adams* as the *sole* author of every odious or unpopular measure during his *reign*? of the *alien* and *sedition* laws, *stamp act*, *standing army*, etc.? when all these are chargeable to Congress, that is, were the acts of a majority of the people; namely, of our honoured sires—who were neither fools nor traitors?

AMERICAN DEMOCRACY.

PART THIRD.

II. WHAT can the government do for the people? I answer, a vast deal; both negatively and positively. "The world is governed too much." And excess is always an evil. To this evil we are extremely obnoxious. We must try to diminish it. This is the first step in the remedial process.

Legislation may be directly, positively, purposely, pernicious, unjust, oppressive. It may *aim* at *good*, and yet be evil in its tendency. It may indirectly occasion much injury. It may operate insidiously, speciously, deceptively. Now all legislation ought at least to *intend* good: and it should, moreover, be so wisely ordered as to produce good, and only good. Every system or act of legislation, tending directly or indirectly to the relaxation of moral principle, or to the encouragement of immoral conduct, is bad. This is done in many ways: As when industry is impeded or discountenanced. When temptations are held forth to fraud, evasion, concealment, venality, perjury, embezzlement, breaches of trust, official corruption or malversation—in order to any selfish, avaricious or ambitious end. The morals of a people are more dependent on legislation than is generally imagined. And where the morals are depraved, there can be no safety and no happiness.

The character of any government may be fairly tested by the condition and character of the people. Where the mass of the people are most virtuous, contented, peaceful, industrious, frugal, enlightened, and secure in the enjoyment of personal, religious and political freedom—*there* the government is of the best character. And a contrary state of things would argue the existence of a very bad government—no matter by what technical *name* the government may be designated. Every *form* of government may be deplorably vicious and oppressive, if corruptly administered.

Our own country exhibits, at this moment, [1842,] a sorry, repulsive, disordered, unhealthy, cheerless aspect. Something is wrong. Without war, famine or pestilence, the whole land is filled with murmuring and complaint, with poverty, wretchedness and crime.—With frauds, forgeries, defalcations, bankruptcies, robberies, murders, arsons, suicides, and profligacy of all sorts and degrees.—With a spirit of the most reckless gambling and speculation: of the most degrading avarice, the most desperate ambition, the most fiendlike violence, the most revolting disregard of all human ties and obligations—a spirit which contemns, repudiates and laughs to scorn every principle of morality, of patriotism, of honour, of law, and of religion.

The Union is in debt; the States are in debt; the cities and banks and other corporations are in debt; honest men and rogues are in debt; and none can pay. We are destitute of credit, at home and abroad. We have no confidence in one another. Enterprise and in-

dustry are palsied, checked, annihilated. The people are excited, alarmed, terrified. Treason, revolution, rebellion stalk abroad at noonday; are abetted, applauded and cheered onward—by those who expect to profit by the spoils. Who or what has occasioned all this darkness, perplexity, ruin and dismay? I shall not accuse either whigs or democrats as the guilty authors.

But with the actual facts and results staring us full in the face: will any man have the effrontery to pretend that these calamities are not attributable to misgovernment? Either our system of government is radically defective, or it is villanously administered. Either its machinery has been unskilfully constructed, or its working has been intrusted to exceedingly incompetent and unfaithful hands. No people on this earth could be so suddenly prostrated, dishonoured and impoverished, except by the all-pervading power and blighting influence of a tyranny the most profligate and capricious, or the most stolid and insane that our world has ever known.

If to all this, it be replied: That with these matters the government has no concern: That the people must look after their own affairs—then I rejoin, that our government is good for nothing: has nothing to do: is a nuisance: and ought to be forthwith cashiered, dissolved, repudiated—and a better set up in its place.

To show, at a glance, the power of legislation for weal or wo, over the morals and habits of a people, I group together a dozen or more *titles* or topics; and leave them without comment to your own reflections.

1. *Taxation*.—Good or bad, according to kind, amount,

mode, objects, etc. Tax *consumption* rather than production; *idleness* rather than industry; *luxuries* rather than necessaries; *foreign* rather than domestic commodities. Never tax *useful* vocations or professions as *privileges*.

2. *Banks*.—Brokers. Currency. Specie. Paper. Credit.

3. *Tariff*.—Bounties. Duties. Monopolies.

4. *Usury Laws*.—Their object. Nugatory; Vexatious.

5. *Penal Code*.—Penitentiaries. Corporal Punishments. Jails. Prisons. Houses of Refuge.

6. *Militia System*.—Expensive, Useless, Partial.

7. *Oaths*.—Nature, Uses, Abuses. Perjury. Profanity.

8. *National Debt*.—State Debts. Banking capital borrowed.

9. *Internal Improvements*.—By the States or by the Nation.

10. *Popular Education*.—School Funds. Public Schools.

11. *Licensing Immoralities* by taxation.—In order to check or suppress them. Sale of intoxicating liquors. Taverns. Gambling Houses. Horse-racing. Theatres.

12. *Freedom of the Press*.—What is meant? Is it to manufacture lies *ad libitum* to mislead the people?

13. *Equal Rights*.—Personal, Political, Religious. How affected by legislation.

14. *Mala Prohibita*.—Smuggling, Usury, most sumptuary and municipal regulations. Contrasted with *mala in se*.

15. *Bail*.—Suretyship. All liabilities and responsibilities assumed or imposed, on account of others.

16. *Debts and Debtors*.—Relief laws. Stop laws. Stay laws. Appraisement laws. Insolvent and Bankrupt laws.

17. *Forms of Trial*.—Duration. Expense. Laws of Evidence. Qualifications of witnesses. Technicalities. Imprisonment before conviction. *Rich* and *Poor* on trial for the same offence. How differently treated? Juries. Lawyers.

18. *The entire Judicial Organization*.—Courts. Judges.

19. *Political Heresies*.—Nullification. Repeal of Charters. Proscription for mere opinions. “To the victors belong the spoils.” Repudiation of State Debts. Dissolution of the Union. Abolition of slavery by those who have no right to meddle with the subject or to agitate the question.

If legislation were sound and judicious upon these and *all* other matters, of course we should be well governed: provided the laws were faithfully administered. *That* people, or *that* constitution is “the freest, which makes the best provision for the enacting of expedient and salutary laws.” (*Paley*.) And that government is the *best*, which in practice most completely fulfils the designs and conforms to the provisions of its establishment. Stability, uniformity, permanence, durability—steadiness, confidence, firmness, good faith, a reliable policy—are essential to individual enterprise and to national prosperity. Any condition is preferable to incessant fluctuations, changes and novel experiments. If we cannot agree among ourselves as to what particular system of domestic policy is best, let us agree to adhere to *some* system. If life, property, character, industry, be duly protected; we shall flourish under any system, which may be fixed, settled and perseveringly maintained.

At present, there is a loud cry of distress all over the land: and the people expect relief in some fashion from the government. They want money: and many demand protection for their industrial pursuits. Hence the war about banks, currency, tariff, bounties, duties, taxes: and hence the violent disputes about the fancied conflicting interests of the several grand divisions of the Republic.

BANKS.—1. *As to money.* Manifestly, no government can create it out of nothing. Tennessee cannot, by incorporating banks, add one dollar to the actual productive capital of the State. And to borrow money from abroad on the faith of the State, for banking operations at home, is a very doubtful policy—to say the least. I have no faith in it. In such case, the State becomes the responsible debtor to foreign capitalists; and her own citizens become debtors to the State. She is the great home creditor: large numbers of the people are her debtors. Now every adroit politician understands his game in this singular position of affairs. He affects to *sympathize* with the poor, unfortunate, oppressed debtors—who have become debtors by borrowing and squandering the State's money—and he promises them relief or indulgence. He represents them as the victims of an odious bank monopoly. But you know the whole story: the end is always visible. The debtors get relief. Honest people bear the loss, and pay the distant creditor: or the State itself repudiates the whole debt, and becomes a voluntary bankrupt.

In the present condition of the country and of the banks, it would be difficult to keep in circulation *here*

more *paper* than the *specie* which it represents. Our banks cannot lend their credit, because they have none. And if they had—such is the rage for foreign commodities, that we are always in debt to the Eastern cities or to New Orleans; and, of course, every bank bill afloat would be converted into something receivable at those remote markets. So that the highest degree of bank credit would be bootless; inasmuch as its paper would not answer beyond the State limits. There was a time when confidence in a bank charter, esteemed good and safe, would have invited investments from abroad: and thus our available capital might have been greatly augmented: as it actually was, a few years ago. This confidence we have abused and forfeited. No distant capitalist could now be tempted to trust his cash to our management, under any legislative guarantee whatever. Neither State nor bank could dispose of stock at par, or hardly half way up to that mark. This resource then is *tabooed* and closed against us. *Credit* is not only money: it is always a great deal better,—especially for the poor, honest, industrious and enterprising, who would make a wise use of it.

Still, many conveniences would result to the public—to the labouring classes—from a judiciously devised system of banking, honestly and ably administered. Were it only to collect together, at some central or commercial point, the small sums of unemployed capital which are scattered over the Commonwealth without profit to any one, for the purpose of being loaned to business men—this would be in itself a boon or advantage not easily

estimated. The lender and the borrower would thus know where to find each other. Many thousands of idle useless dollars might thus be gathered into a bank, by fifties and hundreds, [as in savings banks, by fives, tens, etc.,] were such an institution rendered perfectly trustworthy.

That the existing bank system is essentially vicious, defective and fraudulent, is manifest to all men from the fact, that they have universally suspended for longer or shorter periods; that many have failed altogether; and that not a few have been most nefarious swindling machines from the beginning, and utterly ruinous to the *bona fide* stockholders. They have been constructed upon erroneous principles. The charters seem to have been drafted with a direct view to the benefit of certain bank officers and their favourites; and on purpose to deceive and rob their real owners. There is a singular obliquity or delusion in the public mind on this subject. The prevalent idea is, that the stockholders are the offending and responsible actors in all cases of bank frauds and delinquencies. Whereas, they are seldom permitted to have any agency whatever in its concerns, or any knowledge even of its condition or proceedings. They are generally widows and orphans, or religious and literary institutions, or quiet, peaceful, unsuspecting citizens, or strangers residing at remote distances: and all content with a moderate interest, and safety for the principal thus invested. The stockholders of our incorporated banks are precisely the party which, above all others, need and deserve the special protection of govern-

ment. They have intrusted their property—frequently their all—to banks, under the solemn guarantee, as they believe, of the government. They have confided in the acts and plighted faith of their government: and they are justly entitled to its warranty. But for this security, they never would have hazarded a dollar in any bank. They presumed that the legislature had intended to watch over and guard and safely manage their money, through the agency provided by their own wisdom and discretion. What could induce capitalists in New York or Philadelphia to send their money to Tennessee, to be used by the people of Tennessee, except a well-grounded assurance that the legislature of Tennessee had made their banks perfectly safe business-doing factors or substitutes; who would be duly looked after, and held to their duty, by their masters who had established them? Yet, let a bank go wrong, and all the public indignation is directed against these innocent, unconscious, trustful and cheated stockholders! The absolute losses sustained, through a misplaced confidence in banks and other similar corporations, within the last two or three years, have exceeded probably a hundred and fifty millions!—and without a shadow of fault on the part of the sufferers! Such stupendous frauds, under colour of law, and almost with the countenance and connivance of the legislature, have no parallel in any age or country. “The South Sea Bubble” in England, and Law’s famous bank and Mississippi *hoax* in France, are trifles in the comparison.

What is a corporation? It is a body or number of

persons associated, according to law, to do precisely what any individual might do without legal or special grant from the government. Such is the received definition. While in practice among us, the reverse would seem to be its meaning; namely: A bank corporation is a close body of twelve or fifteen directors authorized to get the control of the funds of some ten thousand credulous men and women; and therewith to do what no individual can do according to law, or without risk of reputation and the penitentiary.

But why not allow an individual to do what a corporation may lawfully do? Is the latter more trustworthy? Experience shows that in *every* instance the corporation has been faithless:* while *some* individuals have proved faithful. In Europe, individual bankers, or mere private firms of two or three persons, have universally sustained their credit better than corporations owned by hundreds or thousands, and governed by a dozen irresponsible officers:—who are more interested as *borrowers* than as owners and lenders. Men always manage their own affairs more prudently and efficiently than do servants and agents. Here is the secret of sound banking. Let the real owner of the capital employ it as best suits his own interest. His object is to lend his money on good security: not to borrow it, or hand it over to wild speculators, who will return neither interest or principal.

Such is the Scottish system of banking. A few small

* All the banks, I believe, suspended specie payment in 1837: and most of them again in 1839: as they had done before during the late war with Great Britain.

capitalists unite their funds, form a company, as they would a commercial partnership, open a bank, attend to their own business, loan out small sums to hundreds of their well-known industrious neighbours, charge interest on what is actually drawn from bank, allow interest upon whatever is deposited by the debtors; and are responsible to the entire extent of their respective private fortunes. This mode has prevailed in Scotland more than a century, and but a single failure has occurred—and that for only about thirty thousand pounds. No act of incorporation is necessary. Banking firms are, like all others, regulated by general laws, and are formed by individuals at pleasure. The Scottish capital is thus kept at home, used at home, and applied to the promotion of home industry. Any honest mechanic, farmer, merchant, lawyer, doctor, parson or schoolmaster, with two good names on his paper, can always get from the nearest bank whatever he needs to start in the world with—fifty or a hundred pounds, it may be, more or less. The bank runs no risk by such loans. It rarely loses a debt: because three men will seldom prove unable to pay a few pounds. Its gains, though moderate, are steady and sure. Such banks have been of infinite service to *bonny* Scotland.

If the profession or business of banking cannot, like other vocations, be open to all men, subject to the laws of the land, as in Europe, we must have State banks, or a national bank, or none at all. The evils of the present system are manifold, inherent, radical, incurable. Better have no banks, than such as now exist. They have not only violated their charters; but the charters themselves

are essentially vicious, contradictory in their several provisions, and altogether impracticable when *strictly* construed. They allow the issue of two or three times as much paper as they [the banks] have specie, while they enjoin constant cash payments on demand: and while the State cannot possibly obtain or create a credit for its banks beyond its own geographical limits. So that a State bank could not safely put into circulation a paper currency much exceeding its actual ability at any moment to redeem or replace with specie. [A national bank may render its notes equally valuable as gold, or more so, everywhere throughout the Union, by using the faith of the nation, and by making the paper receivable at all points for dues to the government.]

No State shall “emit bills of credit;” or “make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts.” This article of the constitution cannot be altered, modified or abrogated by State legislation. A State, therefore, cannot create a *paper* currency; cannot emit bills of credit; and ought not to do indirectly what it cannot do directly. *Qui facit per alium, facit per se.* It ought not to accomplish by banks or by any other agency what is expressly forbidden to itself. State banks ought to possess no privileges or prerogatives which are denied to individuals. Their *notes*, payable at sight, ought always to be the mere *sign* or *representative* of specie, and always exchangeable, the one for the other. So that there never might or could be a depreciated *State paper* currency—the very evil which the constitution intended to provide against and utterly to prevent. Our people

have expected more from banks than they are calculated to afford under any circumstances.

But if we will have State stock banks, the remedies for, or rather preventives of, mischievous banking, are the following, namely: 1. Good charters. 2. Competent and faithful directors and other officers: who have no interest in them except as stockholders, or no interest which is not subordinate to that of the stockholders. 3. Moderate loans: and always to punctual solvent men—as in Scotland. 4. No director or other officer to borrow money, under the heaviest penalties. 5. No voting by proxy. 6. No oaths or obligations of secrecy. No mysteries. 7. No officious or vexatious meddling by government, contrary to charters. 8. The interests or rights of stockholders to be protected against all hazards. These are always identical with the public interest. 9. Directors should be few in number—three or five are enough—and be paid a *per diem* for their services, by vote of the stockholders. 10. President, Cashier, etc. to be paid salaries, fixed in like manner by the stockholders. 11. Directors and executive officers to be held absolutely responsible for every species of mismanagement, whether the result of neglect and ignorance, or of deliberate rascality. Punish them by forfeiture of their private fortunes, or by imprisonment at hard labour; or hang them, if they deserve it. In order to the safe management of a properly organized bank, the directors ought to conduct its affairs as the legal agents or attorneys of the shareholders. Their business therefore is to *lend* money, not to *borrow*: and to carry out or execute all the purposes

and provisions of the charter in good faith. 12. No favouritism. No accommodations to relatives or friends or *great* men or *bold* speculators. No loan to the same drawers and endorsers, exceeding a certain specified amount. 13. The books to be always open to the inspection of the real owners. 14. Security for the note-holders, is simple convertibility of notes into dollars. The same will prevent undue expansions and sudden contractions of the currency.*

2. *A Paper Currency*, of some kind, is indispensable here, elsewhere, in every civilized commercial country. No political party can sustain the constitutional government of this great republic without it. The controversy

* Banks are generally got up: 1. By men who intend to speculate in the stock. They subscribe largely; perhaps, for the whole capital. Pay one or two instalments by *stock notes*; cause the stock to rise in the market by the usual puffing and misrepresentation; get into the Directory; and, at the right time, sell out, at a great advance above par, to *simple* honest people, who pay up in full and in good money. The latter thus become the *bona fide* stockholders: though never allowed any agency in the government of the bank or any knowledge of its actual condition. They are always cheated.

2. By men whose main object is to secure the lucrative offices, as President, Cashier, etc.

3. By men, who, as Directors, intend to borrow for themselves or friends the whole of the bank funds, etc.

These several classes generally unite and co-operate for their mutual benefit—or they are identical.

Thus banks, commenced in the most fraudulent manner and managed by the most rascally agents and speculators, are at length *owned* by *honest* men whose interests are utterly disregarded, and who have no voice or influence in or over their proceedings. In this way, thousands of innocent persons have been swindled out of their property, in every part of the country.

then is reduced to a mere choice of modes and plans, of forms and systems. Between treasury notes and bank notes, it may be. Or between those of different kinds of banks. As banks of a mixed character, like the former United States banks; or mere government banks, like those of Russia, Austria—and Law's, as it became under the Regent. In behalf of the former, [such as the United States banks,] it may be said: The stockholders manage the bank at their own cost; serve the public or the government for nothing; take good care of their own interests, [*i.e.* would do so, could they get an honest Directory—such as I have already described;] which are identical with, or inseparable from, those of the public; do not over-issue, or flood the land with a depreciated and irredeemable paper currency, as governments are prone to do, have done, and are still doing in several European countries.

Possibly a national bank, owned by the Federal Government and the States, in due proportions, might be made superior to any other; or, at least, more acceptable to the people. It would probably enlist a *State sentiment* in its favour. By excluding private or individual stockholders, there would be no ground of complaint about a “moneyed aristocracy,” “rag barons,” “foreign capitalists and foreign influence,” “favouritism,” and interferences with elections or public affairs. There would be no scope for gambling speculations in the stock; as no part or share could ever come into private hands. It would all be national or State property. It would be managed for the benefit of the whole people. Subscription by a State,

or the acceptance of her allotted portion of stock by a State, would be voluntary. And, of course, there could be no *forcing* of a *branch* into any State. No infringement, direct or implied, upon her dignity or sovereignty could be fancied or suspected. This apple of discord, at least, would be withheld.* Or, at worst, the bank, if

* President Tyler *vetoed* two bills to establish a national bank, passed by Congress at their extra session in 1841, chiefly because he deemed it unconstitutional to *locate* a "branch" in any State without its consent: and because such bank ought not to discount private paper, etc. We may ask: Why so afraid of doing the people a small favour even indirectly and incidentally? If there must be some kind of contrivance or machinery or fiscal agency—very like a bank—to carry on the business or operations of the government: why not suffer the people to share its casual benefits, especially when the government will receive no harm? Why make a bank for exchanges only, and refuse it the power of discounting ordinary business notes? Who could be injured by the latter? Is anybody compelled to deal with the bank? If the people like the "monster," and choose to caress it, why object?

Why so much ado about sending a "branch" into a State without its consent? Do you ever ask its consent, when you send it judges, marshals, attorneys, postmasters, etc.? Are not foreigners even permitted to establish themselves anywhere, and to pursue any vocation *ad libitum*? not excepting the borrowing and lending of money—the buying and selling of "exchanges"—or the discounting of notes? This, and more, *they* may do for their own advantage. So may the Bank of England, or any European bank, by their agencies, all over the country. While in the case of the "branch," the benefit accrues to the people. It is sent to them with that object expressly in view. The aim or intention therefore is good—is benevolent. The people ask for this very boon. They beg the government to give them a bank. They entreat—they pray—for this precious favour. No, says the President. The constitution won't allow me. Or rather, my "conscience" will not consent. I have a character at stake. It would be dreadful to appear inconsistent. My reputation is worth more than any law of Congress—more than your interests—more than

corruptly governed, would pass, like all other public treasures, as *spoils* to the victorious office-holders of the party regnant.

A paper currency, issued by the general government, would be everywhere equally valuable. While receivable by government for all debts and taxes, and while properly regulated and restricted as to quantity, it could never be depreciated below specie. In general and in most places, (especially those most remote from the principal seaports,) it would be more valuable than silver and gold. It would *everywhere* command *coin* dollar for dollar. While, in *many places*, it would sell for a specie premium in the open market. The reason is obvious. Gold and silver are not, and cannot be made, equally valuable everywhere. They are worth more in Nashville than in New York or New Orleans; because they cost more to get them here. [The expense of transportation—the charges, namely, for freight, insurance, etc. must always enter into the account.] And yet a Nashville merchant, with dollars in hand, must pay a

the deliberate and loudly proclaimed judgment of two-thirds of the people,—and of all our reverend sages, past, present, and to come! Immaculate conscience! Magnanimous spirit! Glorious character! How heroic!

N.B.—The officers of a “branch” would generally be citizens of the State where it is established. Nothing therefore would be *sent* or *forced* into a State, except capital—that is, *money*—for the sole but voluntary use of the people. If they do not like it, they need not touch it.

I have assumed above, that the people really wish to have a bank. This may or may not be the fact. The President’s position however remains unaffected in either case.

premium of two or three per cent. for a bill of exchange at sight to discharge a debt in New York, or to enable him to purchase goods.

“The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.” (*Constitution*, Art. I., Sec. 8, 1.) How can they be *uniform*, unless payable in or by an article of invariable value throughout the Union? Wheat, tobacco, cotton, rice, sugar, coffee, pork, potatoes, would not answer. Neither would gold or silver. These, like other commodities, are worth more or less at different points, or in different markets. *Paper* alone will meet the exigency—a paper everywhere current; and which costs nothing to send it from one city or town to another, however remote. Such was the character of United States Bank paper.

The Congress shall have power—“To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin,” * * * (*Constitution*, Art. I., Sec. 8, 5.) How is the *value* of coin to be fixed or regulated, except by some rule, measure or standard—like *paper*? Nor is it of any consequence *quoad hoc* whether the paper be above, or below, or equal to *par*, as it is called. It is itself a fixed, invariable quantity. Gold and silver, corn and iron, may vary in reference to *it*: but *it* changes not. It would be *uniform* throughout the Union. People, paying in this paper, would everywhere pay the same *value*—and no mistake. The constitution, then, makes it the impera-

tive duty of the government to create a bank, or to issue a paper currency of some sort.

Moreover, a paper currency has this decided advantage over every other circulating medium, especially over gold and silver, namely: that any amount, greater or less, may be lost, burnt, buried in the ocean or in the Mississippi, without any loss to the State or nation or public or government. Even if the destruction of a bank bill should prove a total loss to the owner, it will be a gain to the bank. Whereas the loss of gold or silver is a loss to both the owner and the public. It is the annihilation of *value*. All lose: none gain. Further, matters might be so contrived, that the loss or destruction of a bank or treasury note, or of a *paper* title of any sort, should not injure any party. Just as the loss of a promissory note or bond, or of a *title deed* to land, may not of necessity involve the utter loss of either debt or land. The *Book of Record* will serve as evidence in either and in all cases.

Highway robbery has been greatly diminished by the general use of paper money. Men seldom travel with large sums of gold and silver, as formerly they were accustomed to do.

Coin is daily growing *lighter* by use—*i.e.* by friction—by ordinary wear and tear. It is liable to injury from clipping, counterfeiting and various modes of debasement. The practice too of *sweating* gold;—that is, by certain chemical applications, taking away some fifteen or twenty-five per cent. of the metal, and leaving the general appearance of the coin the same as before;—has become quite common, both in Europe and in this coun-

try. It has already deteriorated the English gold circulation to such an extent as to render it necessary to call in the whole mass for recoinage at the mint, (1842.) [Note also the galvanic process of coating, or covering, or plating, or gilding the baser metals with gold so as to deceive the most cautious.]

Government Paper. Suppose we cannot get a national bank: may we not have a national *paper* currency? Certainly we may. *First.* Instead of paying gold and silver from the treasury, [when they happen to be in it,] notes, prepared like bank bills, payable to bearer, might be issued. These would be the precise sign or representative of the specie on hand—nothing more. No addition would thereby be made to the amount of the current money or of the national capital. Still, many of the advantages already specified might result from this mere substitution of paper for specie. It would be of uniform and invariable value everywhere—could be transmitted without cost, etc. *Second.* A national debt, (whenever so unfortunate as to have one,) to the amount of twenty or thirty millions of dollars, might be put into the form of government or treasury notes of all sizes, like bank notes; and thus be paid out and circulated as *money* among the people. This would be a clear addition to the currency, above the actual specie in the market; and might possibly prove a public benefit. It would be equally valuable, so long as received by the government in payment of all dues, and while properly limited in amount. It would facilitate exchanges. The paper could be used in lieu of commercial drafts; and the expense of remittances would scarcely exceed the postage.

NOTES.

1. *Great Expense of Banks.*—The excessive multiplication of banks by the States is a grievous burden upon the people, on the score of expense alone—even were they ably managed. There are in Tennessee about twenty banks—principals and branches—with from five to ten *salaried* officers each; besides from seven to fifteen directors. Allowing to each bank *six* executive officers, we have one hundred and twenty persons employed, at an average salary, say of \$1000, or a total of \$120,000 per annum, to superintend a *bad* currency. Then twenty banking houses at a rent charge of \$1000, or \$20,000 a year for the whole. Then insurances, contingencies, losses by bad debts and rogueries of all sorts, may reach to any indefinitely large sum. But set these down at only \$60,000 a year. We then have a total annual tax or charge of \$200,000 imposed on the good people of Tennessee, in order to be furnished with a very poor substitute for United States Bank paper.

There are some 900 or 1000 similar banks in the United States, which, at the same rates as the above, cost the nation nine or ten millions annually. In like manner, there are not fewer probably than five or six thousand salaried officers, and from ten to twenty thousand directors. Reasonable scope here for speculation, political patronage, favouritism, intrigue and genteel idleness!

2. From a mere reading of the constitution, one might infer that the federal government alone had the right to charter banks. That the States retained no right whatever to meddle with the currency, or to emit paper money or “bills of credit,” in any form, or under any guise. This would be a legitimate inference or construction, were it not that several State banks existed at the time when the Convention framed the constitution, viz. :—

(1.) The Bank of North America, (then a Pennsylvania bank,) instituted in 1781.

(2.) Massachusetts Bank, at Boston, 1784.

(3.) Bank of New York, at New York, 1784.

3. The *States* could not *reserve* to themselves the sole *right* of creating a national banking corporation, or a bank which could furnish a uniform currency throughout the Union, because they never possessed either the right or the power. They could not do it, if they would.

4. *A National Currency.*—“The indispensable elements of a na-

tional currency must combine: 1. Uniformity; 2. Safety; 3. Convenience; 4. Convertibility; 5. And entire public confidence. Invariability of value is the great desideratum of currency. So great is the advantage of a paper currency over a metallic, that its tendency is rather to increase than diminish in value, when the basis is perfectly secure; and no greater security can possibly be given, than the plighted faith of the government, to whose hands are confided the fortunes, lives and honour of the people. This is the highest of all possible human security." (*Madisonian*, 1841. The official organ of Tyler's administration.)

5. Are banks *monopolies*? If so, who created them? Who is responsible for their doings? Who culpable, etc.?

6. Are bank charters *contracts*? If so, ought they not to be fulfilled in good faith; even when they prove bad bargains to the people who made them?

AMERICAN DEMOCRACY.

PART FOURTH.

TARIFF, Taxation, Bounties, Free Trade, Revenue, Protection.

The technical term *tariff*, as used in our country, means a list or table of duties or customs to be paid on goods imported—according to some fixed scale or uniform system. Without attempting any formal, elaborate or scientific discussion of this complex, exciting, vexatious and much controverted subject; I merely submit my general views, in few words, under the following heads. I remark:—

1. That, as a mode of taxation, it is preferable to all others. It is a tax on *consumption*—chiefly on luxuries—and is always *voluntary*. It is infinitely better, or less injurious, than a tax on land, or upon production, or than any species of direct tax whatever. Here, again, Mr. Jefferson was orthodox. Among the first acts of his administration, was the repeal of the internal or direct taxes of every kind. (*Tucker*, vol. ii. p. 113.) This is high authority and safe precedent for both whigs and democrats.

2. It is perfectly *equal*—in all sections of the republic, and upon all classes of the people. It operates on *individuals* everywhere—as much so in Massachusetts as in

South Carolina. The individual *consumer* of the foreign goods always pays; and in exact proportion to the amount consumed. It favours none—oppresses none. It is not, and cannot be, sectional or local or partial in its application. It is the fairest and most equitable plan of supplying the necessities of an economical government which human wisdom can devise.

3. The interests of all classes and professions—the farmer, planter, mechanic, merchant, manufacturer—are identical and inseparable. You cannot depress one class of producers, without injury to all the rest. There is no ground, therefore, for jealousy or hostility on the part of any one class or vocation towards another.

4. A distinction ought to be made between a tariff for revenue, and a tariff for the protection and encouragement of home industry. A tariff strictly for revenue, is not intended to prevent or to check importation. Otherwise it would defeat its avowed design. With this single object in view, a judicious tariff would never be higher than the actual condition of commerce could bear without diminishing the dutiable commodities in number or quantity. It should be as light as the exigencies of government would permit. And should be laid on *luxuries* rather than upon *necessaries*—upon *wine* rather than on *coffee*. It is a *tax*: and all taxes are onerous, and generally *odious*. It is difficult to persuade the people that a *tax* is a good thing—a desirable measure—a real favour to themselves. They are naturally and justly suspicious whenever they are told about the blessings of taxation. They do not readily perceive how the taking of their

money is to enrich or benefit them. They have a shrewd notion that more is meant than meets the ear. That it is all a cunning Yankee scheme to get money out of their pockets under false pretences; and for very selfish purposes. That a tariff, in short, is neither more nor less than a robbery of the many for the benefit of the few—or of the South to enrich the North.

It were, perhaps, a wiser policy at once to discriminate between the articles which we must import from abroad, and those which we intend to produce or manufacture at home. Upon the first, levy a sufficient impost or tax to meet the wants of government; and prohibit the importation of the latter altogether: either by a forfeiture of the cargo, or by other penalties; or by so heavy a duty as must soon put an end to the traffic. The people would then understand the whole subject. Two distinct objects would be placed before them. The one, revenue: the other, the exclusion of all foreign goods, which could compete or interfere with domestic industry. The first is a tax—nothing more. It will be regarded and paid as a tax without complaint, if reasonable and moderate. In the other case, it will be seen that the government is aiming directly to foster and sustain certain kinds, or rather all practicable kinds, of home production; and that a tariff for this end, was never designed as a *tax*, but as a preventive—as an obstacle in the way of the foreigner—as a guarantee of a clear field and ample market for the American labourer. Who would object to this? The universal cry is, or has been, the want of something to do—that is worth doing. Every sensible

reflecting man among us sees, knows, and, if honest, avows, that we must learn to manufacture, as well as grow, the raw material. If a tariff of a thousand per cent. on the foreign manufacture, would lead to this result, we ought to pray for the boon. Still, inasmuch as we are eternally mystified and humbugged by the term *tariff*, I would not employ it in this connexion. I would instead, call the thousand per cent. a *penalty*—a *fine*—imposed on the European capitalist who should dare to violate our laws, by sending his wares into our ports to the injury of our own honest labourers. Here would be no tax—not even the semblance of extortion or oppression. It would be direct, positive, manifest protection. And all the people would rejoice and prosper together: if the demagogue will let them alone.

5. The grand desideratum is, to bring as nearly together as possible, all classes of producers—the farmer, manufacturer, merchant. Then a mutual exchange of their respective commodities can be readily, cheaply and profitably effected. Manufacturing cities, towns and villages spring up in the midst of agricultural districts; and the whole country assumes a cheerful flourishing aspect.

6. There can be no *monopoly* in such cases. Exclude the foreign competitor; and the competition immediately commences among our own citizens. Let any man, or set of men, engage in manufacturing cotton, for example; and should the business prove lucrative, others will enter upon the same vocation—and others still—until the profits are reduced to the lowest scale or value of productive capital in other investments. The goods will be

supplied at lower prices by the home manufacturer than ever before by the foreigner. Such is the natural, universal and inevitable course and result of all free competition. Our past experience proves it. It is absurd to talk of a monopoly of any profitable business which is equally open to the competition of fifteen millions of enterprising freemen. Or even if limited to the citizens of several States, the scope for competition will still extend to millions, and thus render any approach to monopoly impracticable.

7. No country has ever prospered long or greatly without manufactures. A purely agricultural country is never rich or powerful. Poland and Turkey may illustrate the truism: Russia has learned the grand secret of national strength and greatness; and is sagaciously devoting her wisdom and energies to the protection and increase of her domestic manufacturing industry. Her immense agricultural capacity would avail but little without it. She invites and encourages foreigners to settle and labour in her midst.

8. *Cheap labour.* Labour is cheaper in Europe than with us; therefore Europe can manufacture for us at cheaper rates than we can for ourselves. Let us see. Agricultural labour is also cheaper in Europe than in this country. Shall we therefore depend on Europe for our corn and potatoes? The logic is as pertinent to the one case as to the other. We had better go to sleep, and let good old Europe take care of us.

9. Our agricultural productions can be indefinitely enlarged. We could grow grain enough to supply half the

world. But what inducement have we to cultivate the soil, beyond a bare subsistence? What is a rich harvest good for, if you can neither sell nor give it away? Had Tennessee a market for all she could produce, she might raise corn and swine enough for the whole Union, at fair prices. This is the very ground of present complaint—namely, our useless superabundance. Farmers know not what to do with their produce. The *Anglo-Malthusian* theory is nonsense in America. We can produce a thousandfold more than we can consume. We could *feed* the British Empire, if her Majesty or her subjects would pay us for the service. Well, then, if our entire labouring force cannot—will not—be expended upon the soil: why not divert it to some other useful sphere of employment? Why not make our own hats, shoes, coats, axes, grid-irons, fish-hooks and Jews-harps? Why import a needle or a pinch of snuff?

10. Better buy, where you can buy cheapest. This is the omnipotent *stump*, street, parlour and Congress argument. I beg Adam Smith's pardon, and Mr. Calhoun's also. But I must say, that this apparent truism is not true. I admit, that if a man have in his pocket a given sum of money wherewith to purchase certain articles, it is best for him at the time and in reference to the cash on hand, to get the cheapest goods of equal quality that the market affords. But, in general, there is a previous question, namely, how is he to get the money? Most people in our country are compelled to earn money before they can purchase anything. Now if it be easier to earn two dollars to give in exchange for a pair of shoes,

made by your neighbour, who wants your corn; than to earn one dollar to pay a shoemaker in Paris, who will not take your corn, and for which there is no market; then is it cheaper to pay two dollars at home than one abroad or for a foreign product. Now this is precisely our case. We have exhausted all our resources in the purchase of foreign commodities: and nobody will buy the produce of our farms. We must, therefore, (a portion of us,) become manufacturers, or manufacturers from abroad must come and live among us: and then we can mutually sustain each other.*

11. *Free trade* is the doctrine of the entire school of modern Political Economy. As a *theory*, it may be sound, orthodox, beautiful—perhaps. But what is—what has ever been—the practice of the commercial world? Does England *practise* agreeably to the *dicta* of her own distinguished professor, [A. Smith?] Conceding the *principle* of a perfectly free trade to be just, liberal, politic, expedient, beneficial: ought it not to be

* I had occasion, while on my journey to this city in November, 1824, to purchase at Chillicothe, Ohio, a pair of plain shoes for one of my little boys. The price was two dollars. They had been imported from the East—probably from New Jersey. Corn was then selling in Chillicothe at $6\frac{1}{4}$ cents per bushel. So that a farmer had to give 32 bushels of corn for a pair of shoes, worth in New Jersey about one dollar,—and where corn was selling at from 75 to 100 cents per bushel. Farm labour was as dear in Ohio as in New Jersey. The cost of producing corn, about the same in each. Had the two kinds of labour been brought into immediate proximity and competition, they would have been equally valuable; and both parties would have been equally benefited by a mutual exchange of their respective commodities.

universal in its application? Ought not the same equitable system to obtain among the several nations which traffic one with another? Can any two nations trade with each other upon equitable and mutually satisfactory terms, where the antagonist principles of *free trade* on the one side, and exorbitant *protective* duties on the other, are maintained by their respective governments?

In order to insure the prosperity of any species of manufacturing industry, *three* things are requisite: namely, 1. Equal intelligence and skill. 2. Equal capital, or sufficient capital. 3. Equal protection, or equal freedom from hostile monopoly and legal favouritism. Wherever superior intelligence, superior capital, and government exclusive patronage prevail, *there* the manufacture will flourish: and might be made to supply, or rather glut, every market in the world not equally favoured. Instance England, as she has been, as she is, and as she is likely to continue. Look at her gigantic tariff, her corn-laws, her colonial and navigation policy, her monopolies of all sorts, her prohibition of every foreign article which can be found or created within the territories of a dominion extending over the fairest and most productive regions of every climate upon the globe. How ought America to act in reference to England? If England will not buy our agricultural products—our wheat, lumber, tobacco, rice—why should we buy her manufactured goods? What is her prospective policy in regard to cotton? In ten or twenty years, she can, if she please, grow cotton enough, within the immense range of her colonial pos-

sessions, to clothe the entire population of our planet—and of the moon to boot—provided she can get there.

12. The advantages of domestic manufactures. Create Birminghams and Manchesters among ourselves—along the banks of our own Cumberland and Tennessee: Why not? Why should we not work up or manufacture our own raw materials? Our cotton, flax, hemp, wool, iron, leather, wood, silk, tobacco? Why send a bale of cotton to England to be manufactured and returned to us, at an enormous (comparative or proportional) expense, for our daily use? Why not send your wheat and maize to England to be ground into flour and meal; and then bring them back again for your daily food? In the latter case, we act sensibly. We choose to export our grain, in a manufactured form, in order to secure the benefit of such manufacture to our own citizens. In like manner, we ought to manufacture cotton, not only for home consumption, but for the foreign market. And we can do it, if our government will effectually protect us. Thus, too, we can do with every other raw material in the country. We can manufacture it for our own use, and export it, when manufactured, to other countries. This is the genuine American policy; and until we adopt and practise it, we exclude ourselves from all the most valuable privileges of independent nationality. We have already rendered ourselves more dependent on England and more serviceable to her, than we were when colonies. She then conceded to us the humble boon of a British market for all our native raw products; and for *these* she

kindly furnished us the goodly wares of her workshops. The latter she is still desirous to supply. The former she indignantly rejects.

13. *A tariff for protection* is not unconstitutional—as is evident from the proceedings of the Convention which formed the constitution; and from all our subsequent and previous history. Nothing is or can be unconstitutional, which is manifestly for the welfare of the republic. If not so, then the constitution is faulty, and ought to be amended; or incurably bad, and ought to be discarded forthwith. Cut the *Gordian knot*, when you cannot untie it. The people never intended to adopt a constitution which should prevent their own government from doing them good—and the largest amount of good.

Besides, if the federal government cannot protect our domestic industry against foreign or hostile competition, it follows that such protection can be sought from no quarter nor be afforded by any existing power or authority whatever. The States have not only reserved no right to regulate or meddle with our commercial interests or foreign relations, but have positively relinquished and surrendered the whole subject to the exclusive control of the national government.

14. The *United States* are one in fact; one in policy; one in interest. Consider the Union, for a moment, as one State. Call it *Carolina*. The whole republic is styled, and everywhere known and honoured as *Carolina*. Who would think of complaining of injustice or inequality or of conflicting interests, under the same

simple, uniform, municipal and commercial code? We should then all be good Carolinians, whether in latitude 32° or 45°. And we should hardly dream of quarrelling about the terms of our traffic and intercourse with foreign nations. Why should the States now regard each other as foreign or *quasi* foreign nations? Or as anything but the component parts or chief divisions of one great commonwealth?

Suppose duties on certain imported goods encourage or tend to encourage the growth of manufactures in Massachusetts: do they (the duties) injure Georgia or any portion of the South or Southwest exclusively or chiefly? If burdensome at all, the burden falls, as before remarked, on individuals.—Upon the citizens of Massachusetts, not less than upon the citizens of Georgia and Tennessee. Hundreds of thousands in Massachusetts must be consumers, besides manufacturers, as well as in the extreme South—where, perhaps, none manufacture—at present.

But throughout the Union, there will be equality of rights; perfect reciprocity of privileges; free and unrestricted traffic; so that capital, intelligence and enterprise will be ever expansive and diffusive.—Will be constantly extending and widening their sphere of operations.—Will gradually find their way to the Gulf of Mexico and the shores of the Pacific. Manufactures will presently spring up even in Carolina, and everywhere throughout the land—if needed, or if profitable to the adventurer.

No monopoly or exclusive privileges can be accorded

to the North or East. If manufactures begin there, it is because *that* is the most appropriate locality for such enterprises and investments at the outset. But, in due time, they will naturally go elsewhere. For every *good* end, the twenty-six or thirty States and Territories may be to each other as so many distinct nations—carrying on all sorts of productive industry unshackled, and of commerce upon the most approved principles of *free trade*. Domestic or internal commerce and the home market, are always the most profitable. Our confederacy, therefore, extending over so vast a region of diversified soil and climate, may command all the advantages which usually accrue from both external and domestic commerce—even were we, by war or other causes, excluded from foreign ports altogether.

15. How is wealth created, accumulated, enlarged, perpetuated? Look at Tennessee *now*. What might not she become, if we could insure within her limits a certain market for a dozen home manufactures of different commodities? How changed would soon be the aspect of the whole commonwealth! Could we exclude foreign competition for twenty years, we should attract foreign capital and capitalists, with foreign operatives and artisans of all sorts; until we could boast of our own Sheffields and Paisleys and Lowells; and thus become independent of both Old and New England.

Previously to the late interruptions and disasters, manufactures were in fact rapidly extending towards the South. They had already gained a foothold in Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, and per-

haps in other States. And with suitable protection, they will flourish wherever the people shall choose to adventure upon the enterprise. Negroes may be converted into operatives anywhere. They are probably better adapted to the factory than to the plantation. And since negroes we must have among us, whether bond or free, the experiment is at least worth making.

What will be the effect of the new tariff bill just passed by Congress, [September, 1842,] time must disclose. It no doubt will operate beneficially, if perseveringly maintained for a sufficient length of time to give it a fair trial.

16. *Bounties*, granted by a State, to encourage home production, are incomparably more burdensome and less effective than a tariff of duties upon the commodities of foreign competitors; and much more objectionable on every account. As a system, it is condemned by all writers and by all statesmen. "A tariff may be framed on such narrow and exclusive views as to be nearly as injurious to a country [as bounties,] but the evil consequences are less palpable; and hence bounties have ceased to be considered as advantageous to the general interest, while high or prohibitory import duties are more or less adopted by all commercial nations." * * *

NOTE.—A tariff to favour the products of particular sections of the country, is partial and unjust—as the duty of $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents on the pound of sugar, to encourage its production in Louisiana. Here the whole population of the Union are taxed to support a limited number of sugar planters, etc. In like manner, the duty on imported raw cotton—it cannot be grown in Maine, Vermont, etc.

Adam Smith remarks, that: "By means of bounties our merchants and manufacturers, it is pretended, will be enabled to sell their goods as cheap or cheaper than their rivals in the foreign markets. * * * We cannot [he adds] force foreigners to buy their goods, as we have done our own countrymen. The next best expedient, it has been thought, therefore, is to *pay* them for *buying*." (*Penny Cyclopædia*.)

"Bounties are a more expensive mode of encouragement than duties and prohibitions, as the money must be first collected by a tax, and then distributed in bounties—a process in which a loss of from two to twenty per cent. is sustained—that is, a bounty of 100 dollars costs the nation from 102 to 120 dollars, according as the collection and distribution of the revenue is more or less expensive." (*Ibid.*, Art. *Bounty*.)

Bounties in England have been discontinued. In this country they seem to find favour just in proportion to our dislike of a tariff. In Maine and Massachusetts large bounties have been paid to the growers of wheat. In several States bounties are paid to encourage the production and manufacture of silk. This is done by Tennessee. Who pay these bounties? The people—all the people—the farmers especially. Here we *tax* the grower of corn, tobacco and cotton, for the sole and exclusive benefit of the silk grower. Whereas, a duty imposed on foreign silk imported, would afford real protection, and be paid only by the consumer or wearer of the silk goods. If the blacksmith were taxed directly and avowedly to pay the carpenter, I suppose the injustice would be ob-

vious to everybody. The same injustice is done to the corn-grower, when you tax him, as you now do, to put money into the pockets of the silk producer. Here you tax the *necessaries* of life to pay for the creation of *luxuries*. There would have been more wisdom in awarding a bounty to the growers of flax, wool, hemp, cotton; and especially to the manufacturers of these or other indispensable articles of existence. Or in giving premiums for the largest crops—for the better qualities—for improved modes of cultivation—for extraordinary inventions or discoveries in the useful arts—for improvements in machinery, farming utensils, etc.

Bounties will never establish or render permanent the "silk business" in Tennessee. This object cannot be effected, except by the concurrent action of all the States in excluding foreign silks. For if the latter are admitted into Kentucky, for instance; how shall we prevent their ingress into Tennessee? In order then to perpetuate the culture of silk in Tennessee, it would be necessary to perpetuate the bounty. That is, continue to tax one portion, or rather the whole, of the people, to enable a few fashionable ladies and gentlemen to show off in silk finery; and to look down with contempt upon the industrious wearer of domestic cottons and woollens. Now the only fair, impartial and effectual method of giving permanent prosperity to the grower and manufacturer of silk, is the prohibition of foreign silk goods by the federal government,—either through the agency of a high tariff, or by a more summary process. This, once accomplished—and the City of *Lyons* would cross

the Atlantic, and be at *home* in the "Great Valley," in less than five years.

The interest of both farmers and mechanics will be far more effectively promoted by duties on imports than by any bounties upon the home product. In this way, our cotton and sugar have long been protected. Whether the new tariff bill (passed September, 1842,) will adequately defend and sustain the growth and manufacture of silk, time must determine. In any event, the State Bounty Act ought to be repealed, or be allowed to expire by its own limitations.

17. *Taxation* may be necessary, proper, beneficial—and yet may be so unwisely levied and collected, as to occasion more harm than good. The *system* is *evil*, when it tempts or prompts to concealment, fraud, falsehood, intemperance, idleness, ignorance, profligacy, wastefulness, crime. Thus England, until lately, taxed knowledge 100 per cent., and suffered *gin* to go free.

The history of the *license* system is curious and instructive. We find traces of it for some two hundred years back. In reference to the sale of intoxicating liquors, the *aim* was doubtless to check or prevent their excessive use, as well as to obtain revenue. The *result* has been, a great increase of intemperance. And so also, in the case of licensed gaming establishments. Persons duly authorized by law to keep drinking and gambling houses, are regarded as privileged parties, who deserve the patronage and encouragement of the public. And they seldom fail to exert the kind of influence which is most favourable to their interests.

A land-tax is always objectionable, when its amount depends on, or is apportioned according to, the increased value created by human industry, enterprise, and the outlay of capital for its improvement. If taxed at all, it should be at a fixed invariable rate, from a valuation of the land in its virgin or unimproved condition—so that the proprietor might enjoy all the fruits of his labours and expenditures, without fear of additional taxes for his pains. Upon this plan, he would be stimulated and urged by the strongest motives, to augment the value of his estate as rapidly as possible. In this respect, the land-tax of Tennessee is injudicious—if not the worst that could be devised. Under the old constitution the system was excellent. It was a determinate sum upon each 100 acres—irrespective of quality or value. Of course, all prices and sales of land were adjusted in accordance with this well known and established law or custom. *Poor* land would sell for less, *rich* land for more, proportionally, in consequence of both being subjected to the same annual tax or charge. At present, under our new constitution, every dollar's value added to the soil, from year to year, by the sweat of the farmer's brow, must be taxed! Unless a very accommodating conscience should dispose him to conceal or deny the truth. Thus you tax industry, and tempt to fraud, at the same time.

In England, the usage is different. “In the year 1692, a general valuation was made of the income of all the land in the country; and, upon that valuation, the land-tax continues to be levied to this day; so that the tax

of four shillings in the pound, upon the rents of land, is a fifth of its rent, in 1692, and not of the actual rent at the present day." (Say, *Polit. Econ.*, vol. ii. p. 228.)

This is probably the true cause of the agricultural prosperity of England: and not her oppressive *corn-laws*, as many seem to imagine.*

* I omit the topics, *Internal Improvements*, *Education*, etc.—What a government *can* and *ought* to do in regard to roads, canals, and all other means of transportation and travelling—what for the diffusion of knowledge and universal education, etc., I have not space to inquire. Besides, I have elsewhere and on other occasions discussed these themes pretty thoroughly.

AMERICAN DEMOCRACY.

PART FIFTH.

THE third head of discourse or principal division of our subject remains to be treated of or discussed, viz.:—

What can the people do for themselves, independently of the government?*

1. They should endeavour, by all means, to acquire a perfect mastery of their own proper business. Very few farmers or mechanics do themselves justice in this respect. They ought to aim at and strive for the highest eminence in agriculture and the mechanic arts. They should do their work well—try to do it better—be willing to learn—make experiments with a view to improved machinery and modes of operation, etc.

2. Persevering industry and rigid economy indispensable from the outset.—As also, sobriety, honesty, order, regularity, punctuality, system.

3. Independence of mind or spirit. Self-reliance. Disregard of popular prejudices about *negro labour*. False pride on this subject. *Slavery*, a prolific source of idleness, extravagance and profligacy. Men who cannot afford to keep slaves, must work themselves or be worse

* Upon this branch of the subject—the most important perhaps of the three—I shall here record only a few general hints for extemporaneous enlargement, as occasion may serve or require.

off than slaves. They can never rise above their present humble position otherwise. They will remain poor, degraded, despised—if too proud to labour. Work as freemen in order to be free. Negroes, a great hindrance to white labour.

4. Knowledge to be sought and acquired in all practicable ways—and from every available source. Educate yourselves. Show how this may be done.

5. Morality—Religion.—Demonstrate their importance even to worldly thrift and prosperity.

6. Refinement of manners. Labourers need not be rude, vulgar, rough, boorish, repulsive, coarse, rustic or uncivil. A gracious demeanour—a courteous address—a quiet, self-possessed, gentle, urbane habit of buying and selling—to be studiously cultivated. Illustrate the value of such accomplishments to the parties addressed.

7. Popular education—as a common cause, and with reference to the general welfare of the people. Show how the entire mass of the labouring people may be benefited and elevated by a higher standard and system of education.

8. Individuals distinguished by genius and learning among farmers and mechanics, do not elevate or dignify the class or body to which they at first belong. They rise above it—leave it—and appear as *stars* in a different sphere. They become physicians, lawyers, preachers, statesmen, politicians, inventors, authors, journalists. They cease to be artisans and labourers. They do not therefore illustrate their primitive humble rank or calling. The mechanical trades or crafts continue as before.

The shepherd, the tinker, the journeyman printer, the shoemaker, the carpenter, the lastmaker,* the blacksmith, the clockmaker, the barber—have gained nothing in public estimation or social privilege, by the intellectual superiority and miraculous achievements of a Shakspeare or Ferguson, a Bunyan, a Franklin, a Sherman or Bloomfield or Carey, a Lea, a Morrison, a Burritt or Bäer, a Rittenhouse, an Arkwright, a Burns, a Fulton.

* Dr. Morrison was a last and boot-tree maker.

THOUGHTS ON PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH GOVERNMENT,
OR ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY.

[NEW ALBANY, INDIANA, 1851.]

THOUGHTS ON PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH GOVERNMENT OR ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY.*

HEADS, TOPICS, HINTS, FACTS—FOR DISCUSSION, ILLUSTRATION, ETC.—BEING THE
OUTLINE OF AN INAUGURAL DISCOURSE, AS PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY OF NEW ALBANY, 1851.

It is proposed, in the present discourse, to attempt little more than a simple exhibition of the principal heads or topics which the subject naturally suggests as worthy of notice; and which, under other circumstances, and especially in the theological class-room, would demand a more ample discussion or illustration. I shall not follow any very strictly historical or logical order in the arrangement of either the facts or arguments which I am about to submit to your consideration. They may, however, be comprehended under two general captions or divisions, viz.:—

* It is due to the author to state, that the manuscript from which these fragmentary thoughts are taken was evidently not prepared by him for publication. A part of the matter was delivered by him before the Board of Directors of the New Albany Theological Seminary, in 1851, when he was inaugurated as Professor of Biblical Archæology and Church Government in that institution. As stated by him at the time, it was intended as a synopsis or compendium of his course of instruction. It was never fully written out, and only a part of it is here published: and that mainly to show the outline of his instructions as a Teacher of Theology. The several *heads* of discourse, in all probability, became the themes of his extemporaneous and conversational lectures to his pupils.—EDITOR.

I. The elementary principles and distinctive features of the Presbyterian Church Polity.

II. Its peculiar advantages and practical results.

With these two objects mainly in view, I shall dispose of my miscellaneous materials in numerical order, just as they occur to mind, without reference to their direct bearing upon either of the above purposes or propositions.

1. Government is a divine institution. This proposition will not be questioned by any who derive their opinions from the Bible; nor, indeed, by any who soberly reflect on the character, condition and necessities of social man. No community, large or small, from the family to the empire, could exist without it. No association, literary, philosophical, religious or benevolent, secret or public, voluntary or involuntary, for good or for evil, can be sustained without government—or without laws, rules, sanctions and penalties.

2. The Bible is replete with examples and lessons on the subject of government—family or domestic, civil or political, religious or ecclesiastical.

3. While it is not pretended that the Bible furnishes exact models for either civil or church polity—adapted to all ages and countries—yet much that is valuable and pertinent to both may thence be learned: and not a few radical and essential principles are clearly inculcated as of universal and perpetual obligation. Such, for instance, is the decalogue.

4. In reference to the Church, we must bear in mind the wide difference between the Mosaic and Christian

dispensations. The first was limited, local, secular, temporary, ceremonial, typical, carnal, worldly and national—at least, in many or most respects. The latter is—and was designed to be—catholic, spiritual, unworldly and perpetual; a religion of peace on earth and good will toward men; of hope, joy, charity and holiness; of everlasting life and felicity through faith in the atoning sacrifice of the eternal Son of God, to all generations, without respect to persons, and without distinction of nations or families.

The worship and ritual service of the tabernacle, and more especially of the temple, were imposing, costly, burdensome, magnificent, and altogether without a rival in external splendour, pomp and grandeur. Whatever appertained to the system or to the priesthood, was also most minutely and accurately prescribed. So particular and so precise, indeed, were the directions and descriptions recorded in the Jewish law-book, that no room was left for doubt, or for diversity of opinion, in regard either to the substance or form of any commanded observance. Thus, the *manner* in which circumcision was to be performed and the passover to be celebrated, was so clearly indicated and so well understood, that no dispute or controversy ever arose upon the subject. Now, in all these respects, the Christian economy presents a direct contrast to the Jewish. Christ's kingdom is not of this world: and he demands the homage of the heart. The temple, the sacrifice, the Levitical priesthood, had accomplished the purposes of their institution; and were superseded

by a service which every sincere disciple or believer could render at any time, in any place, under any circumstances, and without regard to external or conventional formalities. Under the Gospel, no importance is attached to forms or modes. There are no rites or ceremonies—at least, in the Jewish meaning of the terms. Or if Baptism and the Eucharist be exceptions, they are very different in character, object and signification. There is no particularity or specification of details. No minute directions are given about form, manner, time and other incidents. Of course, much is left to human discretion—with a wide scope or margin for differences in mere non-essential modes; and for the exercise of charity and mutual forbearance among Christian sects and parties.

5. The Bible is our only *authoritative* guide and standard in the government and discipline of the Church, as well as in doctrine and conduct.

6. In the absence or want of explicit scriptural directions, we must be guided by the spirit and manifest scope of the Gospel. That system of ecclesiastical polity is best, which most surely promotes, cherishes, and accords with, the principles of the Gospel:—which most effectually maintains purity of doctrine and holiness of life among the people.

7. According to the “judicious” Hooker: “The necessity of polity and regimen in all churches may be believed, without holding any one certain form to be necessary in them all. And the general principles are such, as do not particularly describe any one; but sun-

dry forms of discipline may be equally consistent with the general axioms of Scripture.”

The practical applications of this apparently liberal announcement, by the celebrated author of the “Ecclesiastical Polity,” will be noticed hereafter.

8. Diversity in the forms of church government, as well as in doctrine and ceremonial, has prevailed almost from the apostolic age. These, under various modifications, may be denominated or classified, as Popish or Roman Catholic, Prelatical or Episcopal, Independent or Congregational, Presbyterian, and Erastian.

There are three strongly-marked and distinct systems, which embrace the elementary grounds of difference and controversy among Protestants, namely: The Independent, the Episcopal and the Presbyterian. These appeal mainly to Scripture for their respective peculiarities.

All non-Episcopal churches, as Lutherans, Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, etc., may be regarded as Presbyterian, so far as the question of mere *parity* among the preaching clergy is concerned. The Friends or Quakers claim to be without government, discipline, creed or ministry:—though, in fact, they have them all.

9. In order to arrive at a just and impartial estimate of the scriptural basis of church government, let each one for himself group together, at his leisure, the various passages and facts of the New Testament relating to the subject; and endeavour to ascertain their precise legitimate import in connexion with the context and with each other. Let this be done without prepossession or prejudice. Let us also, with equal candour, consider the

structure and organization of the churches actually established by the apostles: as those of Jerusalem, Antioch, Corinth, Ephesus,—and others.

10. In what respects, and for what purposes, they, or any of them, may be consulted and relied on as authority. As regards the testimony of the Fathers, we should inquire, What do they teach or testify?

11. Candid inquirers generally admit, that the details of church government are not explicitly stated either in the New Testament or in the works of the early Christian writers. They profess to find there only fundamental principles; which, if combined into a system, will naturally lead to these details. These elementary principles, according to the judgment of non-Episcopal Protestants, are UNION, PARITY, REPRESENTATION. These stand out, with great prominence, they think, both in the divine record, and in the writings of the primitive Fathers: and no system of ecclesiastical polity can be scriptural or defensible, from which either of them is excluded.*

12. No *a priori* or presumptive argument in favour of any existing form of church government, as being especially or pre-eminently adapted to the exclusion of error and heresy; or to the preservation of orthodoxy, peace, order and unity; or to the prevention of schism, sectarianism, dissent, controversy or non-conformity; is pertinent, reliable or conclusive.

The primitive apostolic church did not accomplish any of these objects. Bad men were admitted to its commun-

* See Biblical Repertory, vol. xvi. p. 20, etc.

ion and membership—as Judas, Ananias and Sapphira, Simon Magus, Demas, Diotrephes, Hymenaeus, Alexander, etc.

The tares and wheat were suffered to grow up together. Heresies and irregularities of various kinds are specified. Antichrist, even, had begun to appear.

Has any ancient or modern national established church succeeded any better? Roman, Greek, English, French, Dutch, Swiss, Scotch, Genevese? How has it fared with voluntary, free, unprotected, and even persecuted, churches? The past history and the present condition of the numerous ecclesiastical organizations, both in the Old World and in the New, will furnish abundant, if not very satisfactory, answers to all inquiries of this kind.

While we object to this species of argument, as usually paraded by almost every denomination in its own behoof, we nevertheless do hold and affirm that the genuine, scriptural, apostolic system of polity and discipline, is not only the sole legitimate authoritative system, but also the most efficient guardian of truth and holiness in the Christian Church. If it cannot prevent the occurrence or intrusion of heresy and hypocrisy, its seasonable and judicious discipline will, sooner or later, purify the Church, by cutting off, or excluding from its communion, all contumacious incorrigible offenders,—to the extent, at least, contemplated by the divine Head of the Church.

13. Again: the argument in behalf of any church constitution, founded on, or derived from, its assumed or supposed resemblance or analogy to any particular

form of civil government, however specious and popular, is purely *ad invidiam*, or *ad ignorantiam*, or *ad captandum*. It is calculated to mislead, deceive and mystify. Thus, nearly all the sects in our country maintain, that their own respective forms or systems are the most strictly republican, or most congenial to republican or democratic institutions. The Roman Catholic, the Episcopalian, the Independent, the Methodist, the Baptist, are equally positive and dogmatic on this subject, and in this behalf. Presbyterians also are prone to glorify their own time-honoured polity on the same score and in similar fashion;—whether with or without good reason, we leave others to decide.

It is enough for us to stand on scriptural ground. We are able to demonstrate, against all political cavillers and gainsayers, that the genius of Presbyterianism is admirably suited to the genius of the purest Republicanism: while history also teaches that Presbyterianism may be, as it has been, loyal to any and every form of civil government. Witness Germany, France, Holland, Geneva, Scotland, Ireland, America—to say nothing of its infancy under imperial Roman despotism.

Who ever heard of Presbyterians rebelling against a government, because it was monarchical, for instance? Even the American Revolution was not a war against monarchy at the outset. It did not originate in any determined hostility to monarchy as such. Our patriotic sires were conservative in their principles and intentions. They appealed to arms, not to destroy and overturn, but to assert, maintain and preserve their inherited, char-

tered, constitutional, indefeasible rights, as free-born Englishmen. In such a crisis, and for such a cause, assuredly our Presbyterian ancestors were not behind the boldest and bravest, either in the council hall or on the battlefield.

“No bishop, no king,” was the oracular and wily utterance of the British Solomon, (James I.,) and ought never to have obtained currency as an axiom or political aphorism. His own Scottish countrymen and subjects proclaimed its falsity then by their conduct, as they have done ever since. They never opposed their king, as the rightful sovereign of the realm, but because he endeavoured to usurp the headship or kingship of the Church also. James soon discovered that neither force nor cunning would avail, so long as the sturdy Scots continued familiar with kirk sessions, presbyteries, synods and general assemblies: and amenable, in spiritual matters, to no human tribunal or authority. He wished to be *Pope* in Scotland, as well as in England. And had his motto been, “no bishop, no Pope,” it would have exhibited more truth and candour, though less of the politic duplicity and kingcraft for which he was distinguished, and of which he was somewhat boastful

No subjects of the British crown have hitherto been, or are now, more faithful and devoted to their constitutional civil government, than the Scottish Presbyterians. Illegal, violent, arbitrary, vexatious, persecuting tyranny, they have manfully and successfully resisted. But to a constitutional monarchy, equitably administered, they manifest not only no aversion, but the strongest attach-

ment. Where were their sympathies, and how did they act, during the American and French Revolutions?

The entire history of the Scottish Presbyterian Church, during the reign of the despotic and unprincipled Stuarts, is singularly eventful, suggestive, edifying, pathetic:— and is worthy of profound study. Can the world present a parallel case? or an example of equal suffering, privation, sacrifice, endurance? of indomitable adherence to the simple faith and worship of the gospel? and of that primitive martyr spirit which no terrors nor tortures could crush or extinguish?

We might also, in this connexion, cite the tragic story of the Presbyterian Huguenots in France. They, too, were loyal, high-minded, honourable, true-hearted subjects of an almost unlimited monarchy. They pleaded and contended only for the inalienable rights of conscience.

In aristocratic Geneva and Holland, Presbyterianism has hitherto been the creature of the State. Thus, too, has it been, to large extent, in Scotland, since the accession of William and Mary to the British throne, and more especially since the restoration of church patronage [in 1712] under Queen Anne. It is due to the Established Church of Scotland to add, that she has uniformly resisted and protested against all ambitious and Erastian encroachments of the civil power. While the seceding, voluntary and free churches act without dictation or restraint from any external or secular source whatever.

Here mark the difference between real unfettered Presbyterianism, and the same system mixed up with, or sup-

ported by, the civil government. The latter never protects, but to control; never touches, but to soil; never gives, but to receive ten, thirty or a hundredfold in return.

14. Church officers, at the beginning, were designated as: Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Presbyters or Elders, Bishops, Pastors, Teachers, Ministers, Helps, Governments.

The peculiar official attributes and functions of the apostles entitled them to the pre-eminence: and this pre-eminence appears not to have been denied or questioned by their contemporaries. They had no equals or successors, in several most important respects. While, as ministers and preachers of the gospel, all faithful preachers and ministers, of every age and country, have been or are their legitimate and only successors. The *apostleship* was a temporary office. There were only thirteen apostles—including Paul. Barnabas, Timothy, Titus, Epaphroditus, Silas, Junias, Andronicus, etc. were *not* apostles.

Except as teachers, the Prophets had no successors.

Evangelists appear at first to have possessed and exercised extraordinary powers. They were, however, laborious travelling missionaries: and, in this capacity, they are as much needed as ever. Timothy and Titus were evangelists.

The Angels of the seven churches in Asia were probably simple pastors,—or chief presbyters among their brethren in the churches specified.

Presbyters and *Bishops* were identical in meaning: convertible or interchangeable: mere pastors of congregations.

gations or of churches or parishes: parochial, not diocesan, bishops. There were hundreds of such bishops in Asia Minor, Italy, Greece, Northern Africa, etc., where one modern prelate would amply suffice.

15. We may next notice Apostolic succession in the prelatie sense: High Church claims: Episcopal ordination: Laud's tyranny and innovations in England and Scotland: Modern Puseyism: the nature, grounds and dogmas of *jure divino* prelatists or churchmen.

Prelatists maintain: 1. That there was instituted by Christ an order of clergy superior to presbyters, called, first, apostles, then bishops, to whom alone was committed the power to ordain others, and to govern the church. 2. That there has existed a lineal, unbroken succession, from the apostles down to the present bishops of Episcopal churches.*

“There is not a bishop, priest or deacon, among us, who cannot, if he please, trace his own spiritual descent from St. Peter and St. Paul.”†

On the contrary, Archbishop Whately, in his “Kingdom of Christ,” (p. 182,) asserts that: “There is not a minister in all Christendom who is able to trace up with any approach to certainty, his own spiritual pedigree,” (*i.e.* to any of the apostles.)

* * * * “The High Church generally have an ugly trick of unchurching other people, and consigning them to what, in their slang, they call uncovenanted mercy. We have heard the question asked, how such pretensions

* See Presb. Tracts, vol. iv. p. 302.

† So says the Rev. Dr. Hook. See *Shimeall*, p. 248.

should be treated? and we answer, just as Europeans and Americans treat the claims of the Chinese to be regarded as the only civilized nation upon earth. High Churchmen are, in this respect, the Chinamen of Christendom.”*

The apostles appointed no successors—in the sense assumed. None even in place of the deceased of their own number—as of James, the brother of John, killed by Herod. Nor did they give any directions or intimations about the *succession* to their own particular and [as is contended] highly privileged order. Matthias was, by election and by lot, called to the apostleship, not as the successor of Judas, [who had never entered upon the proper duties of the office,] but as his substitute.

16. The early English reformers acknowledged all other Protestant churches, whether Lutheran or Calvinistic, Presbyterian or Episcopal, as sister churches, and as true Christian churches. And many of the ablest and most evangelical ministers and dignitaries of the English establishment have always entertained the same just and liberal sentiments. The Archbishop of Canterbury, [Tenison,] said, in 1707, that he believed the Church of Scotland to be as true a Protestant Church as that of England, though he could not say it was so perfect.†

Tillotson, Tenison, Wake—were liberal and catholic Christian archbishops:—as are Sumner and Whately now.

In a letter to Courayer, dated July 9, 1724, Archbishop Wake wrote thus: “I bless God that I was born and have

* Bib. Rep., vol. xiv. p. 139.

† Hetherington's History of the Church of Scotland, p. 320, note.

been bred in an Episcopal Church, which, I am convinced, has been the government established in the Christian Church from the very time of the apostles. But I should be unwilling to affirm, that, where the ministry is not episcopal, there is no church, nor any true administration of the sacraments; and very many there are among us who are zealous for episcopacy, yet dare not go so far as to annul the ordinances of God performed by any other ministry.”*

Dr. Sumner, the present Archbishop of Canterbury, [1851,] in a letter, speaking of certain continental Presbyterian divines then in London, says: “I hardly imagine that there are two bishops on the bench, or one clergyman in fifty throughout our church, who would deny the validity of the orders of these clergymen solely on account of their wanting the imposition of episcopal hands.”†

17. Even Richard Hooker, the most celebrated and the most ingenious champion and defender of the English Church as by law established, did not assume the ground of Apostolic succession in the Laudean or *Puseyite* sense of the phrase. When, in the latter part of Elizabeth’s reign, “he took up his pen against the Puritans, in justification of the severities practised by the Queen, the Bishops and the High Commission, he spent not his strength upon the particular impositions of kneeling at the sacrament, the surplice, the sign of the cross in baptism, and things of that sort, but laid down the broad PRINCIPLE that the CHURCH has authority to impose such things

* See Mosheim, vol. ii. p. 312, note. Baltimore edition, 1832.

† New York Observer, October 16, 1851.

according to her discretion; and that the conscience of individuals and of particular congregations in such matters is not to be regarded; but that they may be rightly and piously COMPELLED to yield, by whatever PENALTIES good Mother Church and the sovereign prince may find it necessary to employ for the attainment of that end."

"He was sufficiently *judicious* to perceive that on no principle short of this, could the rigours of the Church be justified, or the Church itself, as established in England, be vindicated; and that if this principle could be substantiated, the robes, ceremonies and liturgies were all right; and the fines, the imprisonments, the banishments, and the slaughters inflicted, were all proper, just and wholesome punishments for the coercion of the wickedly rebellious."

Accordingly, the account which Hooker himself gives of his great work on Ecclesiastical Polity, is, that his design was, "To write a deliberate and sober Treatise on the CHURCH'S POWER to make canons for the use of ceremonies, and BY-LAW to IMPOSE AN OBEDIENCE to them, as upon her children, and this he proposed to do in eight books of the LAWS OF ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY."

"This was cutting up the whole matter by the roots. Grant this principle and there is no further dispute about surplices, liturgies and ceremonies; the Church may stand upon her *authority*. There are no rights of conscience in the case; and if any begin to prate about conscience, or hesitate to yield a due *conformity*, they may be righteously silenced, imprisoned, banished, hanged or burnt. A most convenient doctrine, no doubt, for the prelates

and the despotic queen, in her capacity of Head of the Church.”*

Whitgift and Cartwright were among the chief leaders in the controversy. “CARTWRIGHT, the Puritan, maintained that the Scriptures were not only the sole standard of doctrine, but also of discipline and government, and that the Church of Christ in all ages was to be regulated by them. WHITGIFT, the Churchman, held, that the Scriptures were a rule of faith; but not designed to be a standard of discipline and government—that this was changeable, and might be adapted to the civil government of any country—and that the times of the apostles could not be the best model, but rather the first four centuries of the Church, during which she had reached a mature development. In what do these views essentially differ from the advocates and opponents of Patristic theology in the present day?”†

18. Soon after, (about 1588,) “A new principle was promulgated for the support of prelatie power, of a more formidable nature than any that had hitherto appeared, and destined to produce the most disastrous results. Dr. Bancroft, the archbishop’s (Whitgift) chaplain, in a sermon which he preached at Paul’s Cross, January 12, 1588, maintained that the bishops were a distinct order from priests or presbyters, and had authority over them *jure divino*, and directly from God.‡ This bold assertion

* Vide “The Puritans and their Principles,” by Edwin Hall, pp. 124, 125.

† Hetherington, p. 42.

‡ Archbishop Parker died in 1576, and was succeeded by Grindal,

created an immense ferment throughout the kingdom. * * * * The greater part of even the prelatie party themselves were startled with the novelty of the doctrine; for none of the English reformers had ever regarded the order of bishops as anything else but a human institution, appointed for the more orderly government of the Church, and they were not prepared at once to condemn as heretical all churches where that institution did not exist. Whitgift himself, perceiving the use which might be made of such a tenet, said, that the Doctor's sermon had done much good,—though, for his own part, he rather wished than believed it to be true.”*

During the controversies of Elizabeth's reign, “The Court party recognized the Church of Rome as a true Church, though corrupt in some points of doctrine and government; and this view it was thought necessary to maintain, for without this the English bishops could not trace their succession from the apostles. But the decided reformers [*i.e.* Puritans] affirmed the Pope to be Antichrist, and the Church of Rome to be no true Church; nor would they risk the validity of their ordinations on the idea of a succession through such a channel.”†

19. The subject of *Royal Supremacy* claims a passing notice. On the 20th of March, 1534–35, a bill was passed by Parliament abolishing Papal supremacy in England, and declaring the King to be the Supreme Head of the

who died in 1583—and was succeeded by Whitgift—and he by Bancroft in 1604. Parker and Whitgift were fierce persecutors—Grindal, not. Elizabeth died March 24, 1603. Hooker died Nov. 2, 1600.

* Hetherington, pp. 49, 50.

† Ibid., p. 32.

Church of England. Thus Henry VIII. became the first Pope of England.

“To this fatal dogma of the king’s supremacy and headship of the Church of England may be directly traced nearly all the corruptions of the Church, and nearly all the subsequent civil calamities of the British Isles. For it would not be difficult to prove that there can be no security for either civil or religious liberty in any country where the supreme civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions are both possessed by the same ruling power. It matters little whether the ruling power be ecclesiastical, holding the civil subordinate to it, as the Papacy; or civil, holding the ecclesiastical subordinate, as in the case of Henry and his successors; for in either case the result is a despotism; under which the people must sink into utter degradation, or against which they are provoked, from time to time, to rise in all the dangerous fierceness of revolutionary convulsion.”*

Henry himself never became a Protestant. He was as truly the defender of the Roman *faith*, after the abolition of the papal supremacy in England, as when he wrote his famous book against Luther. So arbitrary and so despotic was he in his wayward inconsistency, as to extort from a distinguished stranger in England, toward the close of his reign, the cutting remark, that, “Those who were against the Pope were burned, and those who were for him were hanged.”†

* Hetherington, pp. 17, 18.

† Sir Thomas More was sentenced to be hanged, but was actually beheaded—1534.

20. A *prima facie* presumption against modern High Church prelacy is suggested by the fact, that the terms, *bishop* and *presbyter*, which, all agree, were at first identical or convertible, came at length to designate different offices and orders in the ministry. How shall we account for the change? except by that gradual, imperceptible, insidious process, which is so easy and natural as to elude suspicion and to silence inquiry? The very process is still traceable in early history; and by which, in due time, the more significant term *bishop* came to be appropriated by those who had already won the power of *overseeing* or *ruling over* the church and the eldership or presbytery.*

21. Bishops invariably had their *titles* from the cities, towns, villages, or places of their ordinary residence—from their *sees*, namely, or *sedes*—but never from kingdoms, states, provinces, counties, or other local appellations, indicating or implying territorial jurisdiction, or anything like modern dioceses. The same usage is still nearly universal. The only exception is the Episcopal Church in the United States; where the official style of the Right Reverend dignitary points out the extent of his earthly domain:—as the Bishop of Indiana, of Kentucky, of Tennessee, etc. Every bishop in Europe at this day—and every Roman Catholic bishop in the world—has his *title* from a city or town, agreeably to ancient

* It is easy to cite similar examples: as emperor—imperator—at first, only a military *general* among the Romans. Pope, Patriarch—only *father* in the church. How different now from their primitive meaning! Thus, also, Consul, President, as used by the French.

custom. Now, what gave rise to the custom? Undoubtedly the fact, that the primitive bishops were mere pastors of churches or congregations. There would frequently—perhaps, generally—be only one church or flock in a city or village; then the stated minister would be currently styled the pastor or bishop of such city or village. Should there have been several churches in one city, as in Jerusalem and other large cities, the ministers would constitute a presbytery, with a moderator or president—who, at length, was regarded as the head or bishop of said churches, and finally as the bishop of the city. Long after this innovation, it came to pass that adjacent territory was added to the city or episcopal jurisdiction. Thus the bishop became the ruler of a province. Bishops of great or capital cities became Metropolitans, Archbishops, Patriarchs and Popes. From such humble beginnings have arisen the highest titles and most lordly dominions which have hitherto graced or disgraced the Christian hierarchy. Even the Primate of all England derives his official designation, as Archbishop of Canterbury, from a locality so insignificant, that it would scarcely be known at the present day but from that pre-eminent association.

The fashion, thus early introduced into European and Oriental Christendom, has hitherto continued *nominally* unchanged. While in this country, England's fair daughter has ventured to assume names and titles more fully correspondent with the claims and prerogatives asserted. Rome, more modest or more politic, remains in this, as in more important matters, unal-

tered and immutable. Thus, the real governing Romish Bishop of Tennessee (for example) is styled or *titled* only as the Bishop of Nashville, etc. Until quite recently, the bishops of the American Episcopal Church used to be styled Bishops, not of States, but of the Protestant Episcopal churches within such States. The late venerable and universally venerated Bishop White always wrote, as his official title, "Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese or Commonwealth of Pennsylvania." We have already become familiar with the briefer and more comprehensive forms of—Bishop of Tennessee; of Connecticut; of New Jersey, and the rest. With what extreme facility are such apparently slight changes and innovations effected and adopted, even in this enlightened age and republican country!*

22. Presbyterians cherish no hostility or unkindly sentiments towards any system of church polity, which is not plainly contrary to Scripture; or which does not arrogate to itself exclusive *jure divino* rights and jurisdiction. English and American Episcopacy, as a mere human institution, whether created by Church or State or both, might pass without censure or rebuke. And does so pass, except when it claims to be, or rather when cer-

* By-the-way, I have just as good a right to create a Bishop of Rome or Naples, as the Bishop of Rome has to create a Bishop of Nashville or St. Louis. And upon what ground or plea or pretence, political or religious, a dozen ministers, with a score or two of laymen, more or less, [or indeed any other number less than a majority of the legal voters,] can elect a man to the episcopate over a whole State—of Alabama for instance—so as to make him the Bishop of Alabama—would puzzle a constitutional American to explain.

tain of its members proclaim it to be *the* Church—to the excision or exclusion or unchurching of all non-prelatic churches. We cheerfully concede to others all that we demand for ourselves in the premises.

The Anglican Church is purely and absolutely *Erastian*. As a church, it is powerless. It possesses none of the inherent or adventitious attributes contended for [or rather assumed] by Hooker and others. It is the mere passive obedient subject and dependent of the State. Its articles, creeds, liturgies, rites, ceremonies, offices, benefices, dignities, are created and sustained by the civil government; and may be modified or abolished at its pleasure. Every ecclesiastic, from the country curate to the archbishop, is just as much a creature of the sovereign or of parliament as are the town constable and the lord chancellor or the prime minister. The American Episcopal Church is differently constituted. It admits lay delegates to its conventions; and has no political connexion with the State. *Here*, of course, it cannot be Erastian. All established churches are of necessity, more or less, Erastian. The Scottish Presbyterian, for example,—as well as the English Episcopal: though not in the same degree or to the same extent.

23. The Union of Church and State is another prolific subject. Its history is worthy of special study

In all ages and countries—under all forms of religion; Jewish, Pagan, Mohammedan—the religious and political institutions have been so commingled and blended together, as to be scarcely separable even in theory, and never in practice. The idea of such an anomaly as that

of a religion existing, prevailing, flourishing, without the direct aid, countenance and support of the civil government, seems not to have occurred to the mind of rulers, statesmen, politicians or philosophers. During the first three centuries of our era, the Christian religion became and continued a striking example and demonstration of the resistless energy of divine truth; and of its intrinsic and independent powers of growth and extension. It neither solicited nor expected nor coveted the smiles or bounty of imperial despotism or munificence. It looked for support, neither to the sceptre of the monarch nor to the sword of the conqueror. It advanced steadily and rapidly, not only without worldly friends and legal toleration, but even against, and in spite of, the most determined and unrelenting hostility of every government and sect under heaven.

Constantine the Great was a politic and sagacious prince; and, like his predecessors, was the *pontifex maximus* of Roman Heathendom. He perceived the growing ascendancy of the Christian faith, and the wise expediency of becoming its ostensible, if not sincere, protector. He therefore assumed the headship of the Christian Church, instead of continuing to be the head of the Pagan temple. He thus consummated, what is usually called, a union of Church and State; and what has been erroneously represented as an encroachment of the Church upon the State. Whereas, the direct contrary was the fact. Constantine usurped or assumed the government and control of the Church, as a pillar of the State, or as an instrument of power and influence: and thus it has

been with his successors throughout Christendom ever since. The *true* Church of Christ has never invaded, encroached upon, or sought alliance or connexion with, any civil government whatever. The latter, in the first instance, became the master; and is so, at the present day, in all the Protestant States of Europe. The Romish hierarchy, misnamed the Catholic Church—the most crafty and successful contrivance ever devised by Satan as a substitute for the true Church—the very embodiment and personification of Antichrist—did succeed in gaining the supremacy over secular monarchs and potentates, as well as over the souls, bodies and estates of the people. The great Protestant revolution reversed the order of things, and placed what has been called the Church in the keeping and under the dominion of the civil powers. And every European religious establishment, whether Episcopal or Presbyterian, has been cramped, hindered, oppressed and injured, just in proportion to the degree and amount of the Erastian element infused into its organization.

Until after the settlement of certain English colonies in North America, and scarcely until after the achievement of American independence, was there or had there ever been an exception to the rule; namely, of an empire, kingdom or commonwealth existing without a national or established church or religion. In the United States alone, has religion been left free, untrammelled, self-sustained, and apparently uncared for by either the General or State governments.

Here it would be well to note, and carefully to investi

gate, the condition of the church or churches at and after the Reformation, as modified and regulated by the civil governments. As in France, Germany, Switzerland, Geneva, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Scotland, England and her colonies. More especially, to inquire how Presbyterians were circumstanced, treated, interfered with, oppressed and persecuted—or favoured and patronized and protected—by government. How different also, when disabused of all corrupting patronage and unhallowed influences.

In this country, Presbyterians have always asserted and successfully maintained their perfect independence of the civil powers. This they did, even in the colonies (as Virginia, New York, etc.) where an establishment prevailed; and in spite of legal or illegal pains and penalties,—of persecutions, with imprisonments, fines and banishments.

24. We often hear, in certain quarters, and read in certain books, the English well-known term *Dissenters*—as indicating or describing the *wicked sects* estranged from, or never attached to, holy mother church, of apostolic, episcopal, catholic order, succession and authority.

Of *Dissenters*, there are none—there can be none—in these United States; where no religious establishment exists to dissent from!

Toleration can have no meaning or application here. Nor can there be any *heresy*, as a crime—in the old European legal sense—punishable by any recognized civil or ecclesiastical tribunal.

Meeting-Houses. Why so called? Wherefore still used in some places among us? and more especially by the descendants of the exiled Puritans? All denominations here have the right, if they please, to call their houses of worship *churches*, instead of conventicles, chapels or meeting-houses, (as still they do in England, according to law,) and to adorn them with steeples, bells and organs; and even with altars, crosses, confessionals, baptisteries, pictures or images—according to their taste or fancy.

25. What is religious liberty? Does our own liberal republican government guaranty and secure to all persons the natural indefeasible rights of reason and conscience? Does it tacitly allow any religious sects to infringe these rights and to oppress individuals at pleasure? How do our Romanists, for instance, deal with heretics? And what is *heresy*, in their judgment and according to their canons? What think you of their monasteries and nunneries, or life-prisons for both sexes?—Of their whole array of inquisitorial espionage and vexatious domestic scrutinizing supervision?—Of their vows, oaths, penances, purgatory, indulgences, excommunications, passive obedience to priest and church, clerical celibacy, pecuniary fines and exactions, idolatry in sundry forms, masses, pardons, absolutions, miracles—with horrific anathemas, extending to soul and body, time and eternity?

Ought not the civil authorities to protect individuals—citizens and strangers—in the voluntary inoffensive exercise of their intellect and conscience? and against

all such aggressive and enormous despotism? “Qui facit per alium, facit per se.”

Why should not any man be permitted to read the Bible, [in any language or by whomsoever translated,] if he choose; without dread of abuse, disgrace, loss of *caste*, or forfeiture of property, or of secret and never-to-be-revealed penalties?—perhaps even of a protracted, lingering, inglorious martyrdom? Does not the civil government, in such cases, become the abettor of tyranny? Does it not uphold and encourage the worst, most degrading species of bigotry and persecution? Why should foreign Catholics, as soon as they land upon these shores, be subjected to a spiritual bondage or domination as absolute and vexatious as they had fled from at home?—and necessarily involving all kinds and degrees of secular and social sacrifices and sufferings?

Why should the Pope of Rome have *subjects* among the nominally free citizens of this republic, rather than the Autocrat of Russia or the Grand Turk? If it be asserted that the Pope’s authority here is merely spiritual, it may be replied, that spiritual dominion includes, or is paramount to, all other. Whoever rules the spirit, the soul, the conscience—and determines the future destiny of his adherents—is, in fact, and to all intents and purposes, absolute master of the man.

Is not every Catholic Bishop, or ecclesiastic of whatever rank, dignity or order, bound by oath of fealty or allegiance, or rather of unqualified obedience, to the Roman Pontiff? Is it not a recognized practical principle among them, that the end justifies or sanctifies the

means? That faith is not to be kept with heretics? That, in fact, no man has a right to be a Protestant? That to persecute, is a duty? etc.

Why may not a Jew become a Christian, without hindrance or damage, or danger of persecution from parents and kindred?

I am aware that extreme difficulties beset this whole subject. I would concede, and contend for, religious liberty and the rights of conscience, to the fullest legitimate meaning of the terms. But not so as to give one sect any preference or advantage over another; nor so as to authorize any sect to deal harshly or unjustly with its own members, or to punish, injure or degrade individuals,—contrary to the genius and catholic spirit of the American constitutions—both State and National.

I suppose we would not allow to Moslems or Mormons [in any of the States as, at present, organized,] the practice of polygamy; nor to Hindus the satisfaction of burning widows; nor to idolators of any name the privilege of offering to their deities human sacrifices—even upon the broad ground of religious liberty, or in compliance with the urgent pleadings and demands of conscience.

In all cases, we should carefully distinguish between error and the errorist. We may argue against and condemn *Romanism*, *Paganism*, *Mohammedanism*, *Judaism*, and all anti-scriptural heresies; and yet deal kindly, tenderly, charitably, with the blind, ignorant, deluded followers or professors of any false teacher or false system whatever.

26. Christianity appears under three distinctive and characteristic forms; which may be denominated the Evangelical, the Ritual and the Rationalistic. These forms always coexist in the church, and are constantly striving for the mastery. They have each its peculiar basis, both objective and subjective. The evangelical form rests on the Scriptures as its objective ground; and its inward or subjective ground is an enlightened conviction of sin. The ritual system rests outwardly on the authority of the church, or tradition; inwardly, on a vague religious sentiment. The rationalistic rests on the human understanding, and internally on indifference. These are general remarks, and true only in the general.*

The *evangelical* element prevailed, and animated the reformers, where the civil government either let them alone, allowed them to preach and teach at discretion, or exercised no extreme, arbitrary, or paramount control. Much of this liberty was enjoyed by the reformers on the continent and in Scotland at seasons.

The *ritual* predominated where the government operated *in chief* or *arbitrarily*—as in England, under Henry VIII., Elizabeth, James, etc. So also, in a less degree perhaps, in Sweden and Denmark.

27. It is no part of my present design to attempt a formal or complete exposition of our Presbyterian ecclesiastical polity. Intelligent Presbyterians understand it very well. At any rate, they may learn all about it in our Church Book—where the “Plan of Government and

* See at length, Princeton Review, vol. xiii., Jan. 1846, pp. 138–40.

Discipline" is clearly and authoritatively set forth, as we hold and practise it.

Presbyterianism, in all its essential principles and features, is, we believe, the true apostolic system, as unfolded in Scripture and universally prevalent in the primitive Church. No other ecclesiastical form of government and discipline can prefer equally valid claims to a divine original. To this extent, we believe Presbyterian parity and polity to be established *jure divino*, or by right divine. That it accords with the humble, self-denying, catholic, holy, charitable, unselfish spirit of the gospel more perfectly than any other, we doubt not.

The apostolic church regimen and discipline may possibly have undergone some changes or modifications during the lifetime of the apostles themselves—as experience and circumstances would suggest.

Thus, at first, multitudes were readily admitted into the church—without question or trial—or, at most, upon a simple profession of belief in Jesus as the Messiah.

They were also appointed to office—made elders or preachers—in a rather summary way. Christian converts generally, at least Jewish, appear to have preached as they had opportunity. "Therefore they that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word." (Acts, iii. 4.) Thus, Philip, and perhaps the other Deacons, preached, not as Deacons, but as Christians. Or they may have been directly called to the work by the Holy Spirit. However all this may have been at the beginning, we find a different usage adopted and

recommended at a subsequent period—as may be learned from Paul's Epistles, particularly those to Timothy and Titus.

28. How soon, and how easily, presbytery was perverted from its primeval simplicity; and how naturally an ambitious episcopacy grew up, supplanted and superseded it altogether, can be readily traced in ancient history, and might be aptly illustrated by modern experience.

PRESBYTER was the appropriate, scriptural, technical, official title or designation of the highest ruler or ecclesiastical functionary known during the apostolic age. The term *Bishop* or *Episcopus* indicated the peculiar work or government to be exercised by the presbyter or elder. The Presbyter was to take the *oversight*—*i.e.* to act as the overseer, superintendent or bishop—of the flock or congregation. In other words, the Presbyter was in fact, and, to all intents and purposes, the actual bishop; and the only kind of bishop ever known or heard of during the first century at least. He was merely a parochial bishop—or minister or pastor of a single church.

Modern facts, as well as ancient, show the tendency to a worldly and lordly episcopacy, or spiritual aristocracy. Thus the superintendents of Lutheran churches in Denmark, and the presidents of Lutheran consistories in Germany, are scarcely less powerful than their brethren, the bishops of the Lutheran church in Sweden.

American Methodism is already episcopal, both in name and fact. Methodist Bishops, in this country,

exercise an influence and control over the churches and people of their communion (notwithstanding their Presbyterian theory of ministerial parity,) not surpassed by the prelates of their Anglican mother church.

A *quasi* episcopacy might be introduced into the Presbyterian Church by apparently slight and unimportant changes.—As by the election of life-moderators over our Presbyteries, Synods and General Assemblies. In that event, how soon should we not have among us a superior or higher *order* or *degree* in the ministry!

Again, make the General Assembly a standing or permanent court, with a Moderator or President during life; and we might soon boast of an Archbishop or Patriarch or “venerable Father,” (*papa* or Pope,) as the Head of our republican church.

At present, our General Assembly exists only during the brief period of its actual sessions, some two or three weeks at most. The Scottish assemblies continue by their plenary commissions, during the entire year.

29. Advert to the origin and causes of the diverse systems prevalent in the Protestant churches. Consider the political and social circumstances in which the Reformation took place in different countries.—In Germany, under Luther.—In Switzerland, under Zuinglius.—In France and Geneva, under Calvin.—In England, under Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth.—In Scotland, under Knox.—In Denmark, Sweden, Holland, etc.—Together with the previous influences exerted by Wicklyffe, Huss, Jerome of Prague—the Albigenses, Waldenses, Lollards—etc.

Consider how the Puritans—though at first inclined to Presbytery—from necessity, became independents, (so called about 1640,) when forced out of the established church by Elizabeth and the Stuarts. Why some were called *Brownists*. How, at length, they generally became Congregationalists in name; with a government and discipline, both in Britain and America, bearing some faint resemblance to Presbyterianism. In what respects like? In what unlike? Associations, Consociations, General Associations, with powers merely advisory, it is said. Though, in fact, with substantive or actual authority to ordain, dismiss, suspend, depose, etc.

Strictly speaking, there are few or no Independents of the old Puritan stock or school, in either Old or New England. Why Presbyterianism never succeeded or obtained a firm footing in England, may be historically accounted for and is worthy of special inquiry. (Explain with some details, etc.) How came it to be adopted by the famous Westminster Assembly of Divines? Some say chiefly through the influence of the Scottish commissioners in that assembly. Others hold a different opinion.*

* See Hetherington.

The Westminster Assembly of Divines consisted (as appointed by Parliament, June 12, 1643,) of one hundred and fifty-one (151) members, namely, ten Lords and twenty Commoners, as lay assessors, and 121 Divines. Together with 2 Scotch Elders and 4 ministers. Of the specified list, about 25 never appeared in the Assembly—and to supply the deficiency, the Parliament summoned about 21 additional members who were termed “the superadded divines.” “There were thus, in whole, 32 lay assessors, including those from Scotland; and 142 divines, including the four Scottish commissioners. But of these only

The most sturdy and unyielding opponents of presbytery, during the protracted sessions of the Assembly, were the English Independents [aided by Cromwell,]—though a very small minority. In this opposition, they were zealously supported by the Erastian party—with the learned Selden at their head.

30. Contemplate the character and morals of Presbyterians in all ages and countries. Have they hitherto or ever been—are they now—*morally* worse than others? as subjects or citizens, as men and Christians? Are they not as pious, intelligent, learned, consistent, liberal, just and honourable, as any other denomination whatever? By their fruits shall ye know them. We cheerfully abide the test of Scripture, and the verdict of any competent honest jury of our peers.

31. The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America are unanimously of opinion:

“That God alone is Lord of the conscience; and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are in anything contrary to his word, or beside it

69 appeared the first day [July 1st, 1643;] and generally, the attendance appears to have ranged between 60 and 80.” “They continued to maintain their formal existence till the 22d of February, 1649, about three weeks after the king’s decapitation, having sat five years, six months, and twenty-two days, in which time they had held 1163 sessions.” [Hetherington, *passim*.]

Erastians in the Assembly, viz., John Selden and Bulstrode Whitelocke, Esquires; and members of Parliament. Also, Rev. John Lightfoot, D.D., and Rev. Thomas Coleman. Scottish members: John, Lord Maitland, Sir Archibald Johnston, lay assessors or Elders; together with the Rev. Alexander Henderson, George Gillespie, Samuel Rutherford and Robert Baillie. These had no vote.

in matters of faith or worship: therefore they consider the rights of private judgment, in all matters that respect religion, as universal and unalienable: they do not even wish to see any religious constitution aided by the civil power, further than may be necessary for protection and security, and, at the same time, be equal and common to all others.”

“That all church power, whether exercised by the body in general, or in the way of representation by delegated authority, is only ministerial and declarative: That is to say, that the Holy Scriptures are the only rule of faith and manners; that no church judicatory ought to pretend to make laws, to bind the conscience in virtue of their own authority; and that all their decisions should be founded upon the revealed will of God.”

“There is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ.”*

With us, the Bible is everything. Human authority and tradition are nothing—in the comparison. A people, with the Bible in their hands, are competent, if they will faithfully read and study it, to decide on the claims and qualifications of ministers. They can judge—and they have a right to judge—both of the doctrine and practice of the preacher.

32. Presbyterians ever have been, and still are, zealous in the cause of universal education. They do not dread the light of science and letters and philosophy. They would not, if they could, keep any portion of the

* Confession of Faith, pp. 343, 345, 114.

people in ignorance. They always insist on a learned and thoroughly educated ministry,—on the union of piety and learning. They are well aware that, if the Almighty has no need of human learning in the church, neither has he any need of human ignorance.

In our country, the Puritans of New England, who have always been as nearly Presbyterian as they dared to be without the name, and the Presbyterians of the Middle and Southern States, have been the principal, if not the sole, authors and steady supporters of schools and colleges—and of popular education to the greatest practicable extent. Look at old Harvard, Yale, and Nassau Hall! Calvinistic Puritans and Presbyterians built them all—as they have built many others since. Their example has stimulated other denominations to do likewise.

They too established the first Theological Seminaries. Other sects are following their example. Even those who were lately opposed to a learned ministry and to all the higher schools, are yielding to the pressure, and raising up institutions of their own. They owe much to our early and skilful pioneering.

33. They are friendly to free and thorough inquiry. They dread no investigation or scrutiny, however rigid and searching. They have no secrets—no mysteries—no priestcraft or templecraft—nothing to conceal from the eye of friend or foe. They are never afraid of argument, discussion, debate or controversy—when honourably and candidly conducted. Ever ready to appeal to Scripture, and to abide by its teachings. As witness

Calvin, Knox, Edwards,—and a legion of *giants* in every age.

34. Presbyterians countenance, aid and promote all benevolent, charitable, useful, humane, religious (as well as literary,) institutions, plans and enterprises. They cordially co-operate with other denominations in all good works, and in all schemes for the benefit of mankind. In these concerns and relations, they are probably as *catholic* as any other sect.

35. They are eminently conservative, and temperate, and judicious—in seasons of political or other excitement and popular exasperation. As witness the present *negro mania*—ultra abolitionists at the North, and ultra pro-slavery secessionists at the South. Both extremes, (at least, their demagogue champions,) at the North and South, are evidently aiming at a speedy dissolution of the federal union.

The three General Assemblies of the three grand divisions of the Presbyterian Church harmonize and concur in sentiment on these agitating subjects. They will support the constitution and laws of the republic, as in duty bound, by every consideration which ought to influence the patriot and the Christian.

The Presbyterian host—which has never yielded a passive or willing obedience to any unrighteous law or to any arbitrary tyrant's mandate—will calmly, steadily, faithfully, and successfully, *Deo volente et juvante*, stand by, and uphold, and preserve the Union.

36. They never seek contentions or collisions with sister evangelical churches.—Do not abuse, denounce,

misrepresent or slander them. I have never yet heard a Presbyterian minister, in his ordinary pulpit services, speak an unkind or disparaging word of the Methodists, Baptists, Episcopalians, or other honest Bible Christians. [Unless previously provoked by uncharitable language or bearing on their part; and then, only in self-defence.] It is not their habit. However strong their preference for their own church, and however devoted to its peculiar welfare, they can and do rejoice at every conversion of a soul to God by whatever instrumentality or under whatever ecclesiastical name or form.

37. They sometimes quarrel among themselves. Have family feuds and dissensions—occasionally, pretty hard fighting—rather fierce and bitter combats—and not very creditable to either party concerned. But they seldom, if ever, desert the Presbyterian banner and standards; or make any change either in doctrine, polity or discipline.

The numerous Presbyterian parties or denominations in Scotland adhere firmly and faithfully to the same good old Book of their fathers' honoured Church. They have pursued a similar course in our own country. The only exception to the rule, is the case of the Cumberland Presbyterians. They expunged or modified a *doctrine* which they ignorantly misinterpreted, and which the most intelligent among them are beginning to discover was a capital mistake.—By which they have unwittingly marred the beauty and scriptural consistency of their entire theological system. The common polity they retain intact and unaltered.

Our New School brethren, after sundry novel experiments and trials, are getting back to the ancient basis and to the old paths, which they seemed for a season to have repudiated or forsaken. So that they will, ere long, probably, be regarded as rigidly Presbyterian and orthodox as the mother church ever claimed to be.

38. They do not seek to make proselytes from other evangelical churches. They do not covet the fruits of other men's labours. They never intrude upon their proper province or intermeddle with their legitimate work. All they ask of their good brethren, is to be let alone, and to be allowed to operate freely in their own sphere without rebuke, and without officious or uncharitable or jealous interference.

In seasons of revival—even in our colleges where all the officers were Presbyterian, as at Princeton, N. J.—I have known the most tender and scrupulous delicacy to be observed towards the youthful penitents and converts. Not merely to the extent of advising them to join the churches of their parents, but of declining to receive them into our communion when earnestly solicited, and of sending them home for parental counsel and direction. Such facts I witnessed, while connected with the College of New Jersey, during religious revivals under the presidency of the late Dr. Green. Has any other sect been more liberal, or less proselyting?

39. Presbyterianism has generally found favour among orthodox Congregationalists. The ablest divines in New England have expressed a decided preference for it. Thus, President Edwards, in a letter to the Rev. Dr.

Erskine of Scotland, said: "I have long been out of conceit of our unsettled, independent, confused way of church government; and the Presbyterian way has ever appeared to me most agreeable to the word of God, and the reason and nature of things."* He subsequently became a member of the Presbytery of New Brunswick, and President of the only Presbyterian College then in America. Indeed, they seldom hesitate to take office in our churches, colleges and other seminaries; and to become zealous members of our Presbyteries.

"It would give me no pain to see New England *en masse* Presbyterian in one year." So said the late Rev. Dr. Ebenezer Porter, Professor in the Andover Theological Seminary.†

* Hodge, Hist., Part 2, p. 72.

† See Presbyterian Magazine for September, 1851, p. 413.

Says the New York "Independent," [of October 30, 1851,] the avowed champion of pure Congregationalism: "To us the difference between Presbyterianism a little Congregationalized, and Congregationalism very much Presbyterianized, is not great enough to compensate for the mischiefs of a war which must needs distract the councils and weaken all the enterprises of our evangelical Christianity in its grand struggle with the combined forces of infidelity and superstition."

Says Dr. Dwight, vol. iv. p. 399: "Ruling Elders are, in my apprehension, scriptural officers of the Christian Church, and I cannot but think our defection, with respect to these, from the practice of the first settlers in New England, an error in ecclesiastical government." *Cotton Mather* expressed a similar opinion. As did also the famous *John Robinson*, pastor, etc. at Leyden, in a letter to Sir John Wolstenholme in 1618. He says: "Touching the ecclesiastical ministry, viz., of pastors for teaching, *Elders for ruling*, and deacons for distributing the churches' contributions, as also for the two sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, we do wholly and in all points agree with the French Reformed Churches, according to their published Confession

40. Presbyterians have ever been, and still are, a law-abiding and obeying people. “When men live under a constitution, either in Church or State, they are bound to abide by it, and to seek redress [for wrongs, real or imaginary,] only in accordance with its provisions. It is obvious that no society, civil or ecclesiastical, can long exist, whose members assume the prerogative of redressing their own grievances. In this country, more than in most others, it is important that the great duty of abiding by the law, should be graven on the hearts of the people.”*

Presbyterians hold: “That when any matter is determined by a major vote, every member shall either actively concur with, or passively submit to, such determination; or if his conscience permit him to do neither, he shall, after sufficient liberty modestly to reason and remonstrate, peaceably withdraw from our communion, without attempting to make any schism; provided always, that this shall be understood to extend only to such determinations as the body shall judge indispensable in doctrine or Presbyterian government.”†

41. Our system of Polity—in respect to so much of its machinery and details as may have proceeded from human wisdom and judgment—is not perfect. We do not pretend that it is. It might probably be improved. We think it more scriptural and apostolical, and better

of Faith.” “Their Elders and Deacons are *annual*, or at the most for two or three years; *ours perpetual*.” Elder *Brewster* came over in the *Mayflower*. (From Presbyterian Herald of March 10, 1853.)

* Hodge, p. 336.

† Ibid., Part 2, p. 336.

adapted to the purposes of its institution, than any other. Still, it may not be faultless. We have borrowed much from the legal, juridical and parliamentary usages and practice of Great Britain and our own government. Whether, in these imitations, we have proceeded too far or not far enough, or whether such models or examples ought to be followed at all, might become questions for grave inquiry and deliberation.

Upon a calm survey of this whole subject, perhaps the greatest defect or most obvious want would be found in our singular judicial provisions and proceedings. All our presbyterial or ecclesiastical bodies, from the church session to the General Assembly—without the advantage of a division into two separate houses or chambers—are not only deliberative and legislative councils, but may, at any time, become judicial tribunals or courts for the trial of all cases of heresy or unchristian conduct which can arise under our church constitution.

This anomalous defect is partially supplied in Scotland by a Commission with plenary powers, appointed annually by the General Assembly. Attempts have been made to introduce [or revive] the custom into our church. Among the advocates of the measure was Dr. Hodge in 1846–47. He presented an elaborate report in this behalf to the General Assembly which met at Richmond in 1847. Such, indeed, had been the usage in our church, under Synods, before the creation of our General Assembly, and the adoption of our present constitution in 1789.

Dr. Hodge, in his *History of the Presbyterian Church*

in the United States, after describing the character and functions of the Commission under the Synods, and enlarging upon its advantages, adds as follows: "Our judicatories are sometimes so oppressed with judicial business, that it might be well, on some occasions, to resort to this old usage of our church, and appoint committees with plenary powers. Most men would be as willing to have a cause in which they were interested, decided by ten good men as by a hundred. Much time would thus be saved, and many details of evidence kept from coming before a large assembly."*

Many serious objections might be urged against a Commission like the Scottish—as its acts, for a hundred years, while *Moderatism* was in the ascendant, may abundantly demonstrate. Under the sway of *Moderate* policy, when the arbitrary decrees of the Assembly were regularly carried into effect by these "Riding Committees," as they were termed, we have such fearful examples of the spiritual despotism of which they were made the instruments, as may serve to warn us of the peril of any similar experiment.†

Here we might notice the difficulties and evils of our existing system—of ultimate trial and appellate jurisdiction by the General Assembly. The character of the Assembly—ever changing—often composed of very inferior men—not equal sometimes to many a Synod—and

* Part 2, p. 437.

† For some account of the evils of Commissions, see Hetherington's *History of the Church of Scotland*, pp. 340, 341. See also page 184 for the origin of said Commission in Scotland.

seldom, a fair representation of even the average wisdom, talent and learning of the church. Our commissioners to the highest court are often chosen upon the popular principle of rotation in office, so that each presbyter may serve in his turn, without regard to age or qualifications.

What is the remedy? Why not create a distinct or separate judicial tribunal, or ecclesiastical court, or bench of judges?—An independent judiciary? Such as all enlightened jurists and publicists agree, is essential to the administration of impartial justice, and to the due maintenance of personal liberty, under every form of civil government.

Should the *principle*, of an independent judiciary, be adopted, we next inquire: Shall there be one supreme court, with original and appellate jurisdiction, or with appellate jurisdiction only? together with inferior or subordinate courts—corresponding to our district or circuit courts? How many judges shall there be upon the one, or upon the several benches? For how long a time shall they hold office? By whom shall they be appointed? by Presbyteries, Synods or General Assembly?

Suppose Presbyteries were to continue in the exercise of the same powers as heretofore, and that all cases of appeal, reference, complaint, etc. should be carried up to the district or circuit court; and thence, if necessary, to the supreme court, for final adjudication?

To preserve harmony in judicial decisions, the records of the inferior courts should pass in review before the supreme court; and all illegal or anomalous proceedings be corrected.

The decisions of the supreme court might also be reviewed by the General Assembly, and be approved or disapproved; but never reversed or set aside. If disapproved, reasons should be assigned. The Scottish General Assembly never reverse or annul the doings of their "Commission;" though they sometimes express dissatisfaction.

The ablest and wisest men in the whole church ought, of course, to be chosen for the judicial office. And the elective vote should always be by ballot. Perhaps three or five years might be the term of office.—The incumbents being re-eligible, etc.

The highest or supreme court should sit long enough to dispose of all cases that might annually come before it.

I am inclined to the opinion that one court—a supreme court, of course—would suffice.—[Without any circuit or district or other inferior courts.] Let cases be tried in Presbytery as at present. If further judicial action be advisable, let the parties go at once to the supreme court—just as they now do to the General Assembly. This would greatly simplify the whole system—shorten the time, and diminish the expense of litigation.

The vast extent of our republic will render a change of some kind indispensable very soon. What shall we do with cases arising in California, Oregon, etc.? To say nothing of our Presbyteries in India or other foreign and remote countries? How *small*, comparatively, is old Scotland, our good mother and pattern?—With only 26,014 square miles—and including the adjacent islands, only 29,600?

N. B.—Perhaps the better way would be to leave Church Sessions, Presbyteries and Synods to act as heretofore, and to have one supreme court with appellate jurisdiction only.

42. Presbyterians claim to be true Episcopalians, but not prelatists. They maintain that Presbytery is the true scriptural Episcopacy. They claim to be the legitimate successors of the apostles, though not by any virtue communicated and transmitted in the act of ordination. They also have three orders or degrees or kinds of church officers: as Bishops, Ruling Elders and Deacons. Though they acknowledge but one order in the ministry of the word. With them the scriptural terms, bishop and presbyter, are synonymous. Hence they recognize Episcopal ordination as being identical with Presbyterian ordination—and, of course, equally valid. Our ministers are as truly bishops, and as truly successors of the apostles as his Grace of Canterbury or his Holiness at Rome.*

43. Is it indispensable that a Presbyterian minister or other office-bearer should believe or approve everything contained in our Confession of Faith, Catechisms, Form of Government, Book of Discipline and Directory for Worship? Answer: Men may differ in opinion about non-essentials—such, namely, as do not involve any fundamental doctrine or principle, or such as need not be made matters of conscience—provided no schism, division, hostility or controversy be provoked or encouraged thereby. Men may submit in peace and charity to

* See Biblical Repertory, vol. xiii. pp. 1, 2, etc.

rules and laws which they do not entirely approve. They may, moreover, in a peaceful and legitimate way, endeavour to effect repeals, alterations, amendments or modifications in the existing code, in order to meet their views;—without criminality, and without giving just cause of offence.

1. Thus, many believe that Elders and Deacons ought to be ordained with the same formalities as ministers—namely, by imposition of hands.*

2. Others think that these officers ought to be chosen for short or limited periods—as for one, or two years, etc.

3. Some, again, doubt whether there be any scriptural warrant for the distinction between preaching and ruling elders.

4. Many object to our doctrine or rule concerning the degrees of affinity prohibited in marriage—namely, to the following passage of Section 4, of Chapter 24, of the Confession of Faith: “The man may not marry any of his wife’s kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own, nor the woman of her husband’s kindred nearer in blood than of her own.”

44. In Scotland, formerly, elders were elected to serve for one year. They now hold for life, or during good behaviour. In Holland, and in the Dutch Reformed Church of this country, they are chosen for two years. They are, however, re-eligible. One ordination serves for life. They continue to be elders in rank, order and name—though without authority or vote when not in actual office. In Geneva, the lay elders are twice as

* The late Dr. Miller, among others, entertained this opinion.

numerous as the clerical: and hence their superior control in all church affairs.*

45. *Deacons*. What was their true character? their proper office? their specific duties? How did their ordination differ from that of presbyters? Were there deacons before the appointment of the seven mentioned in sixth of Acts? etc.†

Were there *Deaconesses* in the primitive apostolic church?‡

46. We would denounce no church organization which does not withhold the pure gospel from the people; or which does not preach another gospel, or substitute its own inventions in place of the gospel—as does Rome.

Evangelical, Low Church Episcopacy, such as Whately holds, may be harmless and unobjectionable. We do not quarrel with it—though some do.

47. Presbyterians are everywhere spoken against. All sects unite in hostility to them and their system—either on account of their Calvinistic doctrine or peculiar church polity. So do politicians, philosophers and all sorts of infidels.

48. Church officers. 1. *Apostles*. “And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues.” (1 Cor. xii. 28.)

* For an account of the discussions and decisions about Ruling Elders in the Westminster Assembly of Divines, see Hetherington's History of said Assembly, p. 143.

† See as above, pp. 143, 144.

‡ See Rom. xvi. 1. Also, Coleman's Antiquities, p. 115.

“And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers.” (Eph. iv. 11.)

2. *Prophets*. “Having then gifts, differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith;” etc. (Rom. xii. 6, etc.; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11.)

3. *Evangelists*. (Eph. iv. 11.)

4. *Pastors and Teachers*. (Eph. iv. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 28.)

“Now there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers;” etc. (Rom. xiii. 1.)

5. *Elders*—both *ruling* and *teaching*. “Let the elders that rule well, be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine.” (1 Tim. v. 17.)

6. *Deacons*. For their appointment, see Acts, vi. verses 1 to 6. For their qualifications, see 1 Tim. iii. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.*

7. *Deaconesses*. “The office of deaconess may be regarded as substantially the same with that of *female presbyters*. They were early known in the church by a variety of names, all of which, with some circumstantial variations, denoted the same class of persons.” * * * “Their most frequent appellation however is that of *deaconess, diaconissa*, a term which does not occur in the Scriptures, though reference is undoubtedly had to the *office* in Rom. xvi. 1.”†

“I commend unto you Phebe our sister, which is a

* See Coleman’s *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, pp. 108, etc.

† Coleman, p. 115.

servant of the church which is at Cenchrea." (Rom. xvi. 1.)

49. A comparison of the Levitical with the Episcopal priesthood, will demonstrate that the former was not, and could not be, a type of the latter. The grades are ranged thus:—

<i>Type or Shadow.</i>	<i>Antitype or Substance.</i>
High-Priest,	Bishop.
Priest,	Priest.
Levite,	Deacon.

Now in what do they resemble each other? Did the High-Priest *ordain* the priest? But the discussion need not be pursued further now.

50. Ministers of the gospel may now be regarded as sustaining a twofold character and relation. *First*, as heralds of salvation, duly commissioned to preach the gospel to sinners; and *secondly*, as the officers and advocates of the particular church to which they belong. Thus the Episcopalian, the Independent, the Presbyterian, the Methodist, the Baptist—while they severally break the bread of life and unfold the mysteries of divine revelation in all honesty and godly simplicity—feel it to be their duty also to inculcate and defend their own respective tenets and ecclesiastical polity. These two distinct classes of duty are often so mixed up and confounded, as to occasion bitter controversies, lamentable breaches of charity, and the most egregious mistakes about the essential attributes of genuine piety.

It is desirable, certainly, that every Presbyterian should be made acquainted with the theory, principles and ad-

vantages of the Presbyterian form of church government. Just as it is desirable that every American citizen should be well informed concerning the constitution, laws and policy of his country. Not that this knowledge is absolutely essential in either case to constitute a sincere Christian. But as every man owes allegiance, fealty, obedience, duty, to the civil government which protects him, and to the church which provides for his spiritual wants, and which guides his steps onward and upward toward the heavenly Canaan, it is difficult to conceive that he can be a very exemplary and useful citizen or Christian while ignorant of his relations and obligations in so large a province or department of active service.

A Presbyterian Bishop ought then to instruct his Presbyterian flock upon the subject of Presbyterian Church Government. He ought to show them that church government, like civil government and parental government, is a divine institution—necessary to the very existence of the church, and to the well-being of every society great and small—and, therefore, that obedience to such church government as they may have voluntarily preferred, is as much a duty as obedience to parents or civil magistrates. He ought to show them that the Presbyterian system is scriptural; that is, not only not contrary to Scripture, but as strictly in accordance with apostolic usage as could reasonably be desired; and that, on this score, no other denomination can boast of precedence or advantage. That it is congenial with the tenor, spirit and benevolent character of the entire Christian Scriptures—eminently auspicious to evangelical truth and

purity—harmonizing exactly with the civil government and free institutions of our own favoured country—and that it is in truth as perfect a model of a pure democracy or representative republic as can be found in the world. Should he be called to preach an occasional sermon to a people or congregation, not Presbyterian in government, he ought to say nothing on the subject. He ought *then* neither to laud his own nor to censure any other.—Just as he would abstain from inculcating republicanism or depreciating monarchy in Austria, Britain or Russia.

A man may, however, be a rigid Presbyterian, and yet be but a sorry Christian. And we venture, with all humility, and with becoming deference to superior wisdom and knowledge, to assert, at least to hope, that it is possible for a man to be a conscientious, enlightened, judicious, liberal, charitable, laborious, self-denying Presbyterian bishop, and at the same time maintain the character and discharge the duties of a Christian minister and a Christian citizen as completely as ever did the most devoted apostle; or as do any of our equally conscientious and gifted brethren of other evangelical churches.

Christians have adopted creeds, confessions, or articles of doctrinal belief, which differ from one another. Here it may be observed, that no system of opinions or series of propositions distinctly enunciated, is enjoined in Scripture as the object of faith or as essential to salvation. The faith spoken of in the gospel has respect to an individual, to the Messiah, Jesus Christ, the Son of God and

the Saviour of sinners; and it implies obedience to all his commandments and instructions. The term *doctrine*, in the New Testament, does not mean a speculative opinion, but a practical precept or principle. Every man, with the Bible in his hands, is at liberty to interpret the divine will as therein exhibited, according to his own best judgment. This privilege is conceded to him by the gospel and by the common consent of Protestants. Neither his reason nor his conscience ought to be enslaved, or subjected to the arbitrary will or dictation of any human power or judicatory whatever. He may voluntarily adopt the creed or confession of any church; and then he is bound in conscience and honour to adhere to it, so long as he sustains the relation implied and created by such a connexion.

Protestants intended that the Bible alone should be their paramount rule of faith and practice. In subordination to this principle and with its explicit recognition, they soon found it necessary or expedient to prepare certain compendious formularies, exhibiting the most prominent articles of their scriptural belief; in order to avoid the misconstruction of their enemies, and to maintain harmony, union and concert among themselves. Whether they acted wisely or unwisely, is not the matter of our present inquiry. It would not be very charitable or discreet to condemn their conduct in this particular, until it be shown that any sect or denomination of Christians has been able to get along without a creed of some sort, expressed or well understood. Those, at this day, who have no written

or printed creeds, or who profess to make the Bible their only guide and standard, do nevertheless impose their own peculiar interpretations and translations upon their disciples: and they all have some formal test of qualification for church membership. We have yet to learn whether the Bible, simply and exclusively, and agreeably to each individual's own construction of its import, can be made the sole bond of union, communion and church fellowship among any set or association of Christians.

In this connexion, a question of some practical importance arises: How ought our Protestant Presbyterian Church to regard and treat other Protestant Churches?

1. I answer, in the first place: It would be contrary to the express statutes and pervading spirit of our liberal code, to excommunicate, anathematize or condemn other churches, or to inflict upon them any judicial or formal censure whatever. If we do not like them, we may let them alone. I see no necessity or propriety in ever denouncing them from the pulpit. We cannot enlighten, convince or benefit the distant or absent members of a heterodox church by preaching against them—much less by abusing them. If we believe them to be in such darkness and error as to endanger their salvation, Christian charity and common humanity should induce us rather to send missionaries to convert them, as we would to Pagans, Jews and Mohammedans. Should a Christian Church refuse to acknowledge us as a Christian Church, we are not therefore bound to retaliate, and to render evil for evil. We ought rather to suffer wrong, and to leave the issue with God. Christian charity, however,

does not require us to admit to the ordinances and privileges of our church, the members of any other church, unless we are satisfied in regard to their faith, character and habitual practice. On this subject, as an independent Christian society, we have a right to exercise our own judgment and discretion in the premises. And while we concede to all other denominations the same right, they can have no just ground of complaint or offence. Thus far, the course of duty and propriety seems pretty plain and obvious.

2. But, in the second place: How is a particular church or congregation to regulate its intercourse with other churches, of different names, in the same city or town or vicinage? I answer, that in all cases of church fellowship and intercommunion, a perfect reciprocity of kind and friendly offices ought to obtain. Each should admit the other to be in all respects her equal. If we invite her members to commune with us, we ought, when occasion offers, cheerfully to commune with them at her own board. If we accept her invitation, we ought to reciprocate the favour or the courtesy. But if, on the other hand, she should admit us to her communion and refuse to come to ours; or if we should admit them to ours and refuse to go to hers; it is manifest that, after a fair experiment of this left-handed civility, all intercourse between the parties, as churches, must cease and determine.—Unless one party shall be willing to yield to the exclusive pretensions of the other. A concession, which neither Christian charity nor the laws of self-respect can ever demand.

The same general rule is applicable to occasional attendance on the ordinary public worship of the several churches by the people, and to the exchange of pulpits by the clergy; as also to the use of each other's houses, on any emergency, either for divine service or other purposes; to the recognition of the validity of each other's official acts and ordinances, as baptism, the eucharist, and ordination; and, indeed, to the entire subject, in all its details, of neighbourly intercourse and interchange of civilities. If the whole, and each particular, be not on a footing of acknowledged and open-hearted equality and reciprocity, the parties had better cherish the spirit of brotherly kindness and charity by keeping at a respectful distance from each other's holy festivals and holy places. Mutual suspicion, jealousy, irritation and hostility would be the natural and inevitable result of any half-way course or system. In such matters, there must be no concealment, no duplicity, no mental reservations, no affected superiority, no parade of unmeaning liberality, no protecting condescension, none of that fastidious courtly *delicacy* which insinuates or seems to say, "mine is better than thine," and nothing of that lordly *churchism* and somewhat ludicrous bigotry which boldly proclaims, "my church is the only true church, and your church is no church at all."

Our Presbyteries and Synods are not bound, by any considerations of duty or kindness, to invite ministers of other persuasions to sit with them as corresponding members, whose own conferences or conventions or associations would not, in similar cases, extend

to us the same token of fraternal confidence and regard.

We, as Presbyterians, I trust, will never arrogantly claim or covet what we would not cheerfully accord; nor stoop to surrender the smallest iota even of etiquette which would imply, or could be construed to imply, any inferiority on our part, or the acknowledgment of any superiority on the part of others.

None of these remarks are designed to have the slightest bearing on the common social intercourse of families or individuals. Such intercourse must be regulated by the tastes, interests or caprices of the parties themselves. We may visit, and receive the visits of Jews, Pagans, Turks or Mormons, as may suit our fancy or inclination.

Now should any man conceit that I have betrayed an illiberal or sectarian spirit in any portion of this discourse, I would respectfully beg him to inform us how he would speak of his own church under similar circumstances and in reference to the same points? Would he claim less for his church than I have claimed for mine? Would he concede to other churches more than I have freely conceded to all? Have I not assumed them to be equally honest and conscientious, and equally entitled to all the rights and privileges, temporal and spiritual, which, as religious associations, they may lawfully possess and exercise in this free republic? Am I expected to express a preference for his church, or for any church, over my own? Will he not be satisfied that I leave him unmolested to think as highly of his own church, and as humbly of mine, as he pleases?

But gladly would I hail the dawn of a brighter day—of a purer Christian epoch—when all such idle questions, and verbal controversies, and family quarrels, and jealous rivalries, and ambitious aspirings, shall be forgotten. When celestial charity shall pervade the hearts and the ranks of the Christian soldiery, and all the world be constrained to exclaim: “Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity!” (Ps. cxxxiii. 1.) When Christian sects will strive, not for the mastery over one another, but for the mastery over their own evil tempers, and for the palm of glory in self-devotion to the common cause of God and the Saviour!

THE NECESSITY OF CIRCULATING THE BIBLE.

[DAVIDSON COUNTY, TENNESSEE, NOVEMBER 14, 1826.]

THE NECESSITY OF CIRCULATING THE BIBLE.*

AT the anniversary meetings of this Society, I am informed, an address is expected from the chair. While, on the one hand, I do not wish to depart from established usage, so, on the other, I am desirous to appropriate as little of the time devoted to the exercises of this evening as will barely satisfy the claims of official duty.

The distinguished and eloquent individuals who are expected to advocate the Bible cause, on this interesting occasion, preclude, not only the necessity, but the propriety, of my entering upon the merits of this hallowed and infinitely momentous theme. I shall, therefore, for the few moments which I presume to occupy, merely approach the threshold, and take a hasty glance at the outworks—committing your introduction into the interior of the celestial temple to abler and more experienced guides.

The oracles of the one living and true God—composed at different and distant periods, by divers men inspired for the purpose—were, during a period of fifteen hundred years, entrusted exclusively to the Israelites, and for

* An Address delivered at the third Anniversary meeting of the Bible Society of Davidson County, Tennessee, auxiliary to the American Bible Society, Nov. 14, 1826.

their sole benefit. When, in the fulness of time, the predicted Messiah appeared and put an end to the Mosaic economy and to the whole Jewish ritual, he broke down the partition wall which had hitherto surrounded the favoured nation, and commissioned his disciples to preach the gospel of peace and mercy and reconciliation to every kindred, tongue and people upon the earth. This constituted a new and glorious era in the history of our world. The apostles obeyed the command of their Master. They traversed the most distant and inhospitable regions: and literally planted the standard of the cross in almost every country of the known world. Their success, though astonishingly great, and altogether unparalleled, considering their natural qualifications and means, was but partial and temporary. For, although multitudes in Asia, Europe and Africa, believed—although flourishing churches were everywhere formed—although within three centuries after the crucifixion, idolatry disappeared from the Roman Empire, and Christianity became the established faith of the civilized world—yet it soon appeared that human policy and imperial smiles added nothing to the purity, the lustre and the stability of that spiritual kingdom which it was our Saviour's purpose to erect. Ages of ignorance, darkness, superstition, tyranny and crime succeeded the impious union of the ecclesiastical and the civil powers. The Bible was studiously withheld from the people. It was locked up, in an unknown tongue, in the cell and the cloister. It was inaccessible to the multitude. It was criminal for them to seek it—it was a capital offence to read it. The

terrors of the stake, the rack, the inquisition, were all employed to extinguish the light of revelation. And, had it been possible for the gates of hell to prevail against the truth—the truth had long since been obliterated from the face of the earth. It was not possible. All this antichristian influence, degeneracy, and abomination had been foretold. Its occurrence, therefore, added another series to the manifold existing evidences of the divine original of our holy religion. The word of Jehovah had been pledged that the gospel of his Son should prevail—and finally triumph over all opposition.

The dawn of this distant day of victory and triumph at length appeared, when the glorious work of the Reformation was achieved: and many fondly imagined that the universal reign of the Prince of peace was about to be established on the ruins of the Papal hierarchy. But Protestant Christendom soon exhibited symptoms, not to be mistaken, that the ancient leaven of uncharitableness, malice, pride and ambition was still fermenting within her bosom, and producing the same bitter fruits. Numerous opposing and rival sects speedily arose—and the world has been deluged with volumes of subtle speculations and rancorous controversy. Only the dawn of the bright day of Messiah's triumph, therefore, has as yet become visible. The gospel has ever since, indeed, been gaining ground—though with various fortune, at different periods. The clergy continued to preach, and to perform their arduous functions agreeably to the tenets and rules of their respective churches. But there existed no system of harmonious co-operation—no

bond of union—no mutual understanding—no kindly feeling among the brethren of different names. One was of Paul—another of Apollos—a third of Cephas—(1 Cor. i. 12.) They forgot that they were all of Christ. They would have no fellowship with each other. They were like a house divided against itself;—and hence were feeble and powerless against the common enemy. They consumed their time and spent their strength in domestic broils and contests—instead of generously marshaling their forces under the one great captain, and courageously taking the field, determined, in the name of Jehovah, to conquer, or to die at their post.

It might have been expected that Protestants, who professed the greatest reverence for the Bible, would have spared no means or pains to extend the knowledge and the blessings of it among the people. Especially, after the invention of the arts of printing and of manufacturing paper had rendered the work as easy as it was simple and obvious.

Eighteen centuries however had rolled away since “peace on earth and good will toward men” (Luke, ii. 14) had been proclaimed by the angelic hosts who celebrated Messiah’s advent, before it ever occurred to Christian men, as reasonable and feasible, to distribute the entire unadulterated records of one faith to the ignorant and the perishing. It was reserved for our own age and century to make this grand discovery—and to put into operation this simple but all-powerful machinery.

Until the year 1804, an association for the sole purpose of distributing the Bible, without note or comment,

to all the people, was unheard of. Towards the close of that memorable year was duly organized the British and Foreign Bible Society. It was immediately greeted with the approbation and good wishes of thousands of Christians of all denominations. It bore, as it were, a neutral flag—a flag of peace—of catholicism—of charity and love. It was *Christian* in its entire character, tendency and bearing. It exhibited the insignia of no party, and favoured the views and dogmas of no selfish, ambitious, bigoted or exclusive sect. It opened a field of active philanthropic enterprise, boundless in extent and in duration. It was designed and calculated to concentrate the energies of the Christian world to one grand and good work. It was the first step towards a better understanding among brethren of the same family—towards a better temper and spirit—towards nobler and more generous efforts in promoting the common cause of human happiness throughout the world.

Can it be credited that such a project should have been opposed at the beginning of this liberal and enlightened nineteenth century? Yes verily, it was opposed—opposed most fiercely and perseveringly; opposed too by men who ought to have known better—and from whom a different course might have been anticipated. But, in thus encountering opposition, it merely shared the usual fortune of all great, beneficent and useful plans and institutions. Every man, acquainted with the history of our world, knows that every enterprise undertaken for the welfare of mankind has been opposed. And this opposition is generally proportioned to the excellence of

the object in view. There are always men at hand ready to denounce, to misrepresent, to slander, and to thwart, as far as they can, whatever is virtuous, benevolent and praiseworthy. Many regard every improvement as a dangerous innovation; they fain would travel along as their grandsires had done before them; they are jealous of all reformers, and hostile to all changes. With such men it is vain to argue:—and happily for the world, their complaints and murmurs, their forebodings and predictions have little influence in impeding or retarding the march of human intellect and the melioration of human society. Multitudes oppose at first from ignorance and prejudice; but a successful experiment usually brings them, sooner or later, to a more correct judgment and temper. Others oppose from sheer malice—from downright wickedness; their opposition is deliberate and systematic; and never ceases while the means for maintaining it exist.

The parent Bible Society met with opposition from all these sources: nor has opposition ceased even to this day. Still, the cause has continued to prosper, and to advance far beyond the hopes and anticipations even of the most sanguine. Only twenty-two years have elapsed since this Society commenced its operations. During that period, it has aided, directly or indirectly, in printing, publishing, circulating or translating the Bible, in whole or in part, in 150 different languages and dialects. It has issued in Great Britain and on the Continent of Europe, not less, probably, up to this time, than six millions of copies of the sacred volume;—and, by societies

in connexion with it, a grand total of at least nine millions of copies. Its annual income is little short of half a million of dollars.

The first Bible Society organized in America was that of Philadelphia in 1808, (Dec. 11.) The American Bible Society was instituted in May, 1816. It has been in operation ten years. Its present yearly income is above \$50,000. It has issued, by this time, probably about 500,000 Bibles and Testaments. It numbers already among its auxiliaries not less than 600 societies in various parts of the Union.

There are, it is believed, from 1200 to 1500 Bible societies in the world. And these have issued, as nearly as we can estimate, between twelve and fifteen millions of Bibles and Testaments. Further details, time does not permit me to attempt. And these are not given as literally accurate. They are probably only approximations to the truth.

The objects of this Society are twofold. First, to supply our own domestic wants—to furnish every individual, at least every family, in Davidson County, with a Bible. Has this primary object been effected? Have we searched out the nakedness of the land—have we ascertained how many of our own fellow-citizens—of our neighbours, friends and acquaintances are still destitute of this inestimable treasure? If not—then have we hitherto neglected our first duty, and our most important duty. Let us immediately take this matter into our most serious consideration. Let us resolve—as did the Bible Society of Monroe County in New York, in refer-

ence to the inhabitants of that county—let us resolve, that every family in Davidson County shall be supplied with a Bible. When we have discharged our obligations to our own people—we shall be prepared to attend to the—

Second object of our institution, which is,—To aid the American Bible Society, to which we are auxiliary. This may be done, either by remitting our superfluous funds to the parent institution—or by distributing Bibles in the adjacent counties or States, as we may have opportunity, and as their several necessities may render it expedient.

The deep interest which the parent Society takes in the moral welfare of the Western country, may be estimated from the following paragraphs, extracted from the ninth report of their Board of Managers, (viz. for 1825.)

“The Managers cannot look over the Western States, so vast in their extent, so rapidly increasing in population, and so destitute of the Bible, without painful emotions, and very gloomy forebodings. Notwithstanding all the exertions made in that interesting section of the country, still the increase of population is far greater than the increase of Bibles.”

“Thus a *famine* seems to have already commenced—not of *bread*, nor of *water*! Such a famine could only kill the body:—but a famine of the *Bread of Life*, which kills the soul—a famine deeply affecting the first elements of society in all the Western States and Territories. Of what advantage can early education be to

them, unsanctified by the truth of God? Of what advantage will a liberal education be, if unenlightened by the wisdom of God?—or *legislation*, without the moral principles of God's revealed will?—or *judicial investigations*, without the righteousness and equity of the Gospel? Without the Bible they cannot know the will of God, nor the Son of God:—they cannot possess either holiness or hope; but in heart and in habit they must approximate rapidly to the condition of the frontier tribes.”

Whether this statement be literally correct or not:—let *us*, at least, do our humble part towards preventing the dreadful evils anticipated. Let us arise, in the name of the Lord, and exert our energies and contribute our money in behalf of our Western brethren who are still sitting “in the region and shadow of death.” (Matt. iv. 16.)

To the patriot and philanthropist the Bible appeals for patronage and support. Can any friend of genuine liberty be hostile to the Bible? Let him cast an eye over the page of history, from the creation to the present day, or upon the map of our globe, and search for the land of liberty. Where will he find it? When did it exist? Nowhere—never—except when and where the Bible was known and honoured by the people. This position I maintain fearlessly, and after much inquiry and mature deliberation. Greece and Rome will be made to confront me at the outset. I am prepared to encounter Greece and Rome, with all their boasted pretensions. Liberty was never understood in either Greece or Rome. Republican they were in name;

but republican they never were, as Americans understand the term. Liberty they idolized,—but it was a phantom to fight about, rather than a substantial reality to be enjoyed. The great moral principle, which is the basis of equal rights and privileges, was never recognized among them. There was ever existing in those turbulent democracies a proud domineering aristocracy—opposed to the mass of the people—and seeking every occasion to oppress them.

The people—the body of the people—possessed, in fact, fewer privileges and less liberty, than they now enjoy under the most absolute monarchy in Christendom.

Any person intimately acquainted with their history, and who does not suffer himself to be imposed on by mere names, must be satisfied that such was the fact. If any doubt however—let me add, that, the female sex, among those free, enlightened, polished, liberal republicans, were in a state of degradation and bondage not surpassed in any Mohammedan or Pagan country at the present day. This fact settles the question—universally and forever. For, in every age and nation, where the Bible, or revealed religion has been unknown, or is now unknown—woman was and is a slave.

In Greece and Rome—whatever may be affirmed of the political or civil or domestic condition of the men—it is certain that the women—that is, one-half of the population at least, were strangers to the benefits and blessings of liberty.

Among the Jews—under a peculiar and limited dis-

compensation, woman enjoyed rights and privileges never conceded to her under any system of paganism or false religion whatever. But it was reserved for the gospel of Christ to restore the female sex to their proper rank and dignity in society. This is matter of fact—indisputable and undisputed.

Liberty—real genuine liberty—has been gaining ground in our world just in proportion to the diffusion of the principles of the gospel. In every part of Christendom there is more liberty than in any other part of the world. In those parts of Christendom where the people are most acquainted with the Bible, there is more liberty than in those parts where it is less or least known. In Protestant Europe, where the Bible is accessible to all, there is vastly more liberty than where the people either cannot, or are not suffered to read the Bible.

It would be well for the friends of liberty in our country to examine this matter thoroughly. If they discover, as I am sure they will, that the Bible is always the harbinger of liberty to the suffering and the oppressed, then let them stand forth its avowed friends and advocates.

Our pious and venerated fathers, two centuries ago, fled from a tyranny which the Bible taught them to abhor. They crossed the ocean with the Bible in their hands, and with its principles engraven upon their hearts. They erected the standard of civil and religious liberty in the forests of America. The Bible was their charter—their guide—their statute book—their code of common law. Under its invigorating influence, succes-

sive generations flourished in peace and freedom. And when the first insidious attempts were made to limit their privileges—to encroach on their liberties—they, with one mind, and with the Bible still in their hands, resolved to live free or die.

What made the British colonies to differ so essentially in character and destiny from all other European colonies? I answer, the Bible. The present British colonies in North America were originally French colonies; and hence, at the period of our revolution, they took no part with us. The Bible was a stranger to them—and they were strangers to liberty.

I have addressed an argument for the Bible to the friends of liberty; grounded upon known incontrovertible facts: and if they will not yield to it, or manfully meet it, and confute it, they stand self-convicted of inconsistency and insincerity. If I am correct in my view of the subject, I am justified in this broad and sweeping conclusion—that, every opposer of the Bible is an enemy to liberty, and of course, to his country and to mankind. He may be self-deceived—he may err through ignorance—still he is an enemy to liberty, and unworthy of the liberty which he enjoys, and which he is aiming indirectly, perhaps unconsciously, to destroy.

Our appeal, then, to the patriotic friends of liberty in behalf of the Bible is made on tenable and substantial grounds; and will not, we trust, be made in vain.

Shall we appeal, in the next place, to the ladies—to our mothers, our sisters, our wives, our daughters? I have already suggested a consideration, which, to them

at least, must appear sufficiently momentous and persuasive. Independently of the Christian religion, they would all be slaves—worse than slaves—the slaves of barbarians, of brutal and ferocious masters. The cause is gained. My fair auditors have enlisted under the banners of the cross. They will all become active and zealous members of our association.

The name of every lady in this house, and in Davidson County, will be added to our catalogue, and thus, ten thousand dollars, in spite of the lords of creation, will find their way into the Bible treasury. Should any lady refuse to contribute a dollar per year to promote the temporal and eternal welfare of three hundred millions of her sisters, might she not, with justice, be regarded as an enemy to her sex? But poverty, ignorance, misery have never yet appealed to the female heart or purse, in vain. All the world besides may frown, and treat the wretched applicant with contumely and scorn—but woman will sympathize, pity and relieve. She ever mourns with those that mourn, and weeps with those that weep.

In the last place, we appeal to Christians—whether real or nominal—of every age, sect and denomination. Perhaps you are all included under this head. We hope you are. Were there any infidels present, I would not treat them harshly or uncourteously. I would repeat to them a well-known anecdote, from high authority, and leave the application to their own sagacity.

“Sir Isaac Newton set out in life a clamorous infidel; but, on a nice examination of the evidences for Chris-

tianity, he found reason to change his opinion. When the celebrated Dr. Edmund Halley was talking infidelity before him—Sir Isaac addressed him in these or the like words. ‘Dr. Halley, I am always glad to hear you when you speak about astronomy, or other branches of the mathematics, because those are subjects which you have studied, and well understood; but you should not talk of Christianity, for you have not studied it. I have, and I am certain that you know nothing of the matter.’”

Why men should be hostile to the Bible, is not easy to account for, except on the ground of ignorance or malignity. The pre-eminent excellence of its moral code, I believe, has never been questioned. Even the atheist Vanini, who was most indefatigable in searching out objections against Christianity, owned that he could find nothing in it that savoured of a carnal and worldly design.

Bolingbroke says—“No religion has ever appeared in the world, of which the natural tendency is so much directed as the Christian, to promote the peace and happiness of mankind; and the gospel is one continued lesson of the strictest morality, of justice, charity and universal benevolence.”

The testimony of Gibbon is remarkable. “While the Roman Empire (says he) was invaded by open violence, or undermined by slow decay, a pure and humble religion gently insinuated itself into the minds of men, grew up in silence and obscurity, derived new vigour from opposition, and finally erected the triumphant banner of

the cross on the ruins of the capitol." (Rom. Hist., vol. i. p. 392.)

Again he adds—

"The Christian religion is a religion which diffuses among the people a pure, benevolent, and universal system of ethics, adapted to every duty and every condition of life; recommended as the will and reason of the Supreme Deity, and enforced by the sanction of eternal rewards or punishments." (Rom. Hist., vol. ii. p. 200.)

If such be the real character and genuine tendency of the gospel, in the judgment even of its enemies, who need hesitate about giving it currency among the people? So far as this world is in question, it is calculated, confessedly, to do immense good:—and it has never been pretended that it would prove injurious to our future hopes, prospects or destination.

To appeal to Christians in behalf of the Bible—and to urge reasons and motives to induce *them* to aid in its circulation—would seem a superfluous task—were not the melancholy fact before us, that, by far the greater portion of the human family are still destitute of this hallowed treasure. More than six hundred millions of our race are living in ignorance and misery—deprived of the heavenly guide to purity and peace and happiness which it is in the power of Christians, and of Christians only, to communicate. This lamentable and alarming fact is enough for us to know. Were every inhabitant of these United States—were every individual in Christendom possessed of a Bible—still, six hundred millions of our brethren remain to be supplied with it—and

these are daily giving place to other and to successive millions.

With all the gigantic efforts made and making—the work seems scarcely yet to diminish in magnitude. Nay, the more we search—the further we extend our vision—the larger appears the field for benevolent and vigorous enterprise. The vastness of the object to be achieved was not conceived by the original projectors of Bible Societies. The alarming deficiency of Bibles, in the very heart and centre of the most highly favoured portions of Protestant Christendom, was never conjectured or suspected. Every report of almost every Bible Society testifies, that, multitudes of families and individuals are everywhere to be met with, as ignorant of the Bible as if they had been born and educated in a heathen land. Can Christians continue lukewarm or inactive in the midst of this moral gloom and darkness and death and despair? Can they pray to the great Head of the Church, from day to day,—“thy kingdom come”—and yet refuse to contribute an effort or a dollar towards its enlargement?

If the Bible really contains the best religion—the only religion worthy of universal acceptance—a religion manifestly emanating from eternal and infinite wisdom—our duty to aid in its propagation becomes too obvious and imperative to demand proof or illustration. This duty constitutes a part of the religion itself—it is inculcated throughout the volume which unfolds it. Admit the truth of the Bible—and the duty to extend its blessings to all men follows of necessity. Otherwise,

we reject a most important part of the system which we acknowledge to be of divine authority. This argument is brief—but it is conclusive.

No man was ever impoverished by giving, in the spirit of charity, to charitable objects. This is a remarkable fact in the history of benevolence, and in the history of our world.

Who is it that murmurs or complains at the frequent calls made on him, at the present day, for aid to useful, humane and religious objects and institutions? Precisely the man who never contributes a dollar to one of them.

The avaricious, selfish, miserly idolaters of Mammon, who hoard up gold, as if they expected to carry it to heaven with them, or to create a heaven out of it upon earth; the dashing, expensive, prodigal votaries of fashion, luxury, pleasure, ostentation, who covet all they can grasp, in order to maintain a style of extravagance or indulgence which is neither comfortable nor respectable,—these are the men who denounce all liberal projects and Christian enterprises as impositions on the public, and endeavour to cry them down as the offspring of knavery, hypocrisy, puritanism or priestcraft. From such men, the Bible cause expects nothing—asks nothing. Let them keep their money—they will be the poorer for it. Or let them squander it upon their vices and follies—they will never enjoy it.

While the liberal man will become the richer and the happier for all that he bestows in charity. If universal experience establishes any one maxim or principle of human conduct more clearly than another, it is this.

And that it accords with the declarations of eternal truth and wisdom, every reader of the Bible knows full well. "The liberal deviseth liberal things; and by liberal things shall he stand." (Isaiah, xxxii. 8.) "There is that scattereth, and yet increaseth; and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, but it tendeth to poverty. The liberal soul shall be made fat; and he that watereth shall be watered also himself." "It is more blessed to give than to receive." (Acts, xx. 35.) It is your distinguished privilege, Christian brethren, to realize, this evening, the promised blessing of the Almighty Saviour, by fulfilling his command.

THE CLAIMS OF THE BIBLE.

[DAVIDSON COUNTY, TENNESSEE, OCTOBER, 1830.]

THE CLAIMS OF THE BIBLE.

AN ADDRESS BEFORE THE BIBLE SOCIETY.*

CHRISTIAN charity is, we trust, beginning to develop her genuine character throughout the Christian world. Christian people are beginning to feel and to acknowledge that the Saviour's valedictory command—"Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature," (Mark, xvi. 15)—is addressed to them—collectively and individually; and that a dreadful wo is denounced against those who slight or seek to evade it. It is impossible to retain the blessings of the gospel in any community, large or small, where no active and faithful efforts are made to impart the same blessings to others. The gospel cannot be monopolized or hid in a corner: and those who hazard the profane and impotent attempt, are sure, in the end, to lose themselves what they so covetously withhold. The very spirit of the gospel impels its friends to communicate it to the ignorant and the needy, to the labouring and heavy laden, to the guilty and the perishing. They cannot do otherwise, without giving infallible evidence that they are but enemies in disguise. "Freely ye have

* Delivered at the Anniversary Meeting of the Davidson County Bible Society, October, 1830.

received, freely give," (Matt. x. 8,) is inscribed in golden capitals, upon every page of the Christian charter. To believe the gospel, and yet to be indifferent, or backward, or slothful in recommending it, and in furnishing it to the destitute, according to our ability, involves a palpable contradiction; and if any one lesson, more distinctly than another, can be learned from the history of the church and of mankind, it is this—namely, that those who neglect the duty of teaching and extending, as far as practicable, *the true religion*, do invariably incur the severest frowns of Heaven, and involve their posterity in the most awful calamities—including always either the utter forfeiture, or the most deplorable perversion, of the truth itself.

The command then has gone forth—"Preach the gospel to every creature." This command is binding on all those who already enjoy the light and blessings of the gospel. It is their duty to send it where it is not. It is our duty to do this; and this is precisely the object of our present meeting. It is to contribute a reasonable portion of our superfluous or useless dollars to aid in circulating the Holy Scriptures among our ignorant, guilty, perishing fellow-men—not merely as a matter of grace and favour on our part—but as an imperative duty and a high privilege.

If the Bible be the word of God—if its pages speak truth—then there is an end of all cavilling, or doubt, or hesitation. The course of duty is obvious, plain, direct, straightforward—and cannot be mistaken.

But admitting the truth and inspiration of the Bible,

do you ask what special benefits it confers on the world—or why *you* should be urged to aid in sending it to the destitute?

I shall not attempt to point out all the benefits which the Bible *has* conferred upon our world, or which it is calculated to bestow. It would be impracticable to do this, within the limits of an ordinary address, even were I competent to the task. To candid well-informed men, who have carefully studied the history of mankind, nothing need be urged in the way of contrast between the general character and condition of Heathen and Christian nations. The distance of the one from the other, in a political, civil, religious and social point of view, is so immense, that no representation of ours could render it more obvious or more striking. It is as the cheering light of perpetual day opposed to the gloom and horror of endless night.

But all Christendom is not Christian. Only a small number of any Christian land live and act up to the standard of Bible principles: while the great mass of nominal Christians are still strangers to its purifying and transforming influence. We must therefore recur to the sacred volume itself, to ascertain the genuine nature and tendency of its doctrines and precepts: and how these ought to operate on the life and practice of men. The question is not, what men, calling themselves Christians and professing to believe the Bible, actually are; but what they *ought* to be, and *would* be, were they sincere in their professions. A Judas was found even in the original little band of our Lord's

apparently devoted and disinterested disciples, when scarcely a motive for hypocrisy or treachery could have been imagined. That the fires of persecution were not sufficient, even in the apostolic age, to repress that spirit of worldly avarice and ambition which is so natural to mankind, the cases of Ananias and Sapphira, of Simon Magus and many others, will abundantly testify. How much more then may we expect hypocrites and knaves in the bosom of the Christian Church, when so many sinister ends may be compassed by the mere assumption of the Christian name? But does the Bible countenance hypocrisy or fraud or deception in any form? Does the Bible sanction false, empty, vain, selfish, ostentatious parade or profession of religion in any degree? If not, then the Bible is not chargeable with the errors or crimes or delusions of any of its pretended friends. Are Christians irascible, revengeful, implacable, illiberal, intolerant, avaricious, proud, vain-glorious, ambitious, envious, cruel, haughty, overbearing, unjust, sensual, luxurious? Does the Bible inculcate or permit, or in any wise excuse or justify anger, revenge, unkindness, intolerance, covetousness, pride, envy, ambition, cruelty, injustice, sensuality, or any unhallowed passion or practice?

But what does the Bible reveal and teach? It reveals the whole truth concerning the origin, character, condition and destiny of man; and the whole truth, so far as is adapted to mortal capacity, respecting the glorious perfections, laws and purposes of the one living and true God. It teaches man how to become holy and happy—how to escape deserved punishment—how to conquer sin

and death and hell—how to triumph over all the enemies of his peace—and how to enter the gates of the New Jerusalem with songs of victory upon his lips and the joys of salvation in his heart. All this the Bible has done, is doing, and will do, to the end of time. It is specially calculated—purposely designed—to make men better, wiser and happier, than they could otherwise possibly become. Were it perfectly obeyed by all mankind, our world would be a universal Eden—a paradise of angels:—and peace, purity and happiness would be the inheritance of every individual of our race.

If the Bible should have free course and be duly honoured, the great work of improvement and reformation—the plans and systems for ameliorating the moral, intellectual and physical condition of the people, about which statesmen and philanthropists are so much busied at the present day, would be speedily brought to a successful issue. We should hear no more of prisons, and jails, and penitentiaries, and houses of refuge and correction; or of any other clumsy contrivances for the punishment of crime or the suppression of vice. Nor should we hear of any visionary schemes for the reformation of hardened veteran offenders, which oppress an innocent community by their enormous expensiveness, without the slightest tendency to benefit the criminal,—for no unprincipled convict was ever yet reformed by any course of prison discipline which has hitherto been devised; nor will such a result ever be witnessed while human nature remains unchanged. The Bible—the religion of the Bible—has, indeed, transformed a thief upon the cross,

and it has reclaimed the tenant of a dungeon; and the same heavenly religion might have prevented the ignominious death of the one and the incarceration of the other. The Bible is the only effective instrument of radical reformation in prisons—as all the superintendents even of the most highly approved Eastern penitentiaries, of the newest construction, will testify, and have testified. How much easier and more humane would it not be to imbue the youthful mind with Bible principles, and thus save the rising generation from crime—from servitude—from stripes—from the severest corporal and mental agonies—as well as from the indelible disgrace of imprisonment?

“Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it.” Here is a divine command, and a divine promise,—constituting a part of that heavenly truth which we are required to disseminate among all people. Train up a child in the way he should go—that is, in the right way—in wisdom’s ways—in the way of truth and righteousness:—do this honestly, faithfully, prayerfully, perseveringly—and Jehovah has declared, that he will not depart from it when he is old—or that his riper, maturer years, and old age will be spent aright, or in obedience to the divine will. The command and the promise are universal and absolute: and the world cannot exhibit one instance of a failure. What a lesson is here for parents to learn! What a debt do they not owe their precious charge! The present and the everlasting welfare of their offspring depends on their fidelity. But, without the Bible, they can neither per-

form nor understand their duty, in this or in any other respect. It is not for us to speculate about the probabilities or chances of eventual success, even should the Bible be placed in every family in our land or in the world. It is sufficient for us to know that those who have not the Bible cannot possibly train up their children in the right way, or pursue the right way themselves. They must live in darkness, error, ignorance and vice—and thus must live their children, and their children's children—until some future more generous and more charitable generation shall supply them with the word of life.

How vain and impotent and visionary would be all human schemes and laws in restraining the wicked passions and propensities of mankind, were the fears and sanctions, the rewards and penalties of religion banished or obliterated from our country? In what nation upon earth have merely human institutions sufficed to maintain a peaceful, orderly, tranquil state of society, independently of the aid of religion? What could our own much lauded and most Christian system of jurisprudence—our common and statute law—our excellent constitutions—our legislative assemblies—our juridical and executive authorities—effect for the peace, virtue, prosperity and happiness of this people, were the Bible forthwith annihilated, or were its doctrines and principles universally disregarded—were its moral and religious influence no longer felt throughout the community?

The firm popular belief in the one scriptural doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishment, is more

potent and operative in deterring the million from vice and crime, I venture to assert, than all earthly wisdom, power and vigilance ever yet exerted by any government.

Besides, human laws, at the very utmost, can reach but a little way in controlling and regulating the intricate and complex machinery of human interest, reason, passion, prejudice and ambition. They can touch only the overt act of the offender; and that too only when duly proved by competent witnesses before a court or jury of fallible, perhaps of partial, or ignorant, or prejudiced, or unjust men. The thief, the robber, the murderer, may, under certain circumstances, be legally punished. But still, thousands who are thieves, robbers and murderers in the sight of God, and agreeably to the Bible, may and do, even now, escape every human penalty. What then would be the condition of society, if our whole population dreaded nothing but a human or temporal penalty? So numerous are the facilities or expedients by which punishment may be evaded, that the wonder is, that any should be so incautious or so unfortunate as to become its victims, by being detected in the critical predicament which technical precision requires in order to conviction. Hence, in fact, only the most ignorant and least artful malefactors are ordinarily made to atone by personal suffering for their offences:—while your more intelligent and more astute rogues contrive to pass along, without even rendering themselves obnoxious to any disgraceful or onerous penalty whatever. It is not difficult for a crafty knave so

to act his part as to be accounted an honest man. He will take a slight advantage in his pecuniary transactions—in his sales and purchases—of this man and the other man—and thus be continually accumulating unrighteous gains—while yet he violates no human law in such a manner as to be liable to prosecution:—and perhaps none will dare openly to accuse or censure him. Whereas, the man who fears God and reveres his law would no sooner take a dollar unjustly, under any pretext, from any mortal, than he would steal a dollar from his neighbour's purse or pick his pocket.

It is universally admitted by moralists, civilians and jurists, that, only *perfect* rights, as they are technically styled, can be asserted and protected by human government—and these only to a limited extent and in a partial manner; while *imperfect rights* and their corresponding *imperfect obligations* rest for their acknowledgment and fulfilment exclusively upon the conscience or moral sense of every individual; and these include all the duties which we owe to God, and by far the greater number and the most important of those which we owe to ourselves and to one another.

Human laws are defective because they cannot reach the heart, which is the fountain of all that is evil and of all that is good in human action. They cannot create or influence motive, or inspire virtuous principles. They do not extend to that odious catalogue of secret crimes which are committed without any witness, save the all-seeing eye of the omnipresent God: whose laws penetrate the hidden recesses of vice, and carry their sanctions to

the thoughts and intents of the heart. Now, it will be conceded, that if a man's heart—if all his affections, desires, motives, principles, purposes and aims, be pure and holy, then will his conduct be right. Here, then, the essential, and otherwise incurable deficiencies of human laws are supplied by the doctrines of the Bible, which lend a constant and energetic aid to the administration of justice. The sacred Scriptures command the utmost purity of heart and life. They strike at the root of all sin, by removing every inducement to its commission. They teach that mere external acts, however specious and commendable in the sight of men, will not insure the divine favour, unless they spring from holiness of heart. They moreover disclose the alarming fact, sufficiently obvious indeed to the eye of natural reason, but which natural reason is ever loth to admit, that the heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked.—“That the carnal mind is enmity against God—is not subject to the law of God—neither indeed can be.” (Rom. viii. 7.) They therefore inculcate the absolute necessity of a great radical revolution in our whole moral character, in order to desire, and approve, and relish, and love the purity and righteousness and excellence of the divine law, government, attributes and dispensations. And they conduct us to the altar of sacrifice, where an all-sufficient atonement has been made to satisfy the claims of justice forever—to the bleeding victim upon Calvary—to the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world. At the outset, then, the Bible provides richly and completely for the fallen, sinful, desperate and helpless con-

dition of man—and thus qualifies him for a life of faith, obedience and moral purity.

The Bible also teaches the soundest principles of civil liberty. The rights of man were never understood by any pagan nation. Greece and Rome were, at best, but turbulent aristocracies. Real liberty was never known among them. Acts of oppression, cruelty and injustice are recorded in every page of their brilliant and captivating history. They were never governed by law and principle. The first grand charter of human rights and privileges and genuine freedom with which our world has been favoured, was the New Testament. It contains indeed no elaborate discussions about the several forms of government; nor does it say a word about monarchy, or despotism, or oligarchy, or democracy. It interferes not directly with any existing government; but it everywhere inculcates such doctrines as tend inevitably to banish every species of tyranny and oppression from the face of the earth. Such doctrines as will, if duly regarded, insure to all the people, whether of a monarchy or republic, equity, peace, protection and every lawful privilege and enjoyment.

The Bible moreover imparts consolation to the afflicted, bereaved, mourning, indigent, deserted and friendless. Alas! how many of these abound in our wretched uncharitable world! Misery, in some form, is the natural and inevitable lot of a great proportion of our guilty race. Whither shall the oppressed, the persecuted, the destitute, the sorrowful, flee for refuge, but to the bosom of a merciful and gracious Redeemer;—and where can

they learn the way to this divine and all-sufficient Deliverer, Protector and Friend, but in the Bible?

The Bible exalts the female sex to their proper rank in society. How much does not woman owe to the gospel of Jesus? Is it possible that she should be an infidel—an enemy to that revelation which has ennobled her existence, and raised her from slavery and degradation to an equality with the proud lords of creation?—which has made her the friend and companion of the good and the wise among all intelligent and consistent believers? For it is only among these, that her rights, even in this enlightened and liberal age, are fully recognized, and her character fairly appreciated. No human laws, in any country, have, as yet, afforded her adequate security against the violence, and the arts, and the injuries of man. The laws of honour do not protect her from the grossest wrongs. Towards her, every unchristian man may enact a tyrant's part, without fear of legal penalty, or check, or rebuke. She is liable, especially if poor, dependent and friendless, to become the victim of fashionable, wealthy, powerful, titled, profligate man in every Christian land;—while her reckless destroyer may triumph, and prosper, and be caressed by his equals in rank as a meritorious and fortunate individual. To the salutary, restraining, purifying influence of the gospel is she exclusively indebted for that measure of justice, kindness and consideration which is so generally conceded to her in Christian society: but which is manifested uniformly, and from principle, and to the full extent of her just claims, only by Christian men. Let woman show her

gratitude by her works. Let her manifest her regard for the Bible—for the gospel of blessings to her sex—by sending it to soothe and elevate her sisters throughout an ignorant and oppressive world.

The Bible—should it ever have free course and be glorified—will put an end to war, to ambition, to intemperance, to duelling, to murder, to robbery, to injustice, to all angry and malevolent passions, to prejudice and all uncharitableness, to gambling, and to every human folly, extravagance and vice. It will prove the cheapest possible remedy for all the ills which flesh is heir to.

Loud and angry have been the complaints against Bible and other benevolent associations, on the score of their expensiveness—uttered too by men who never contribute a dollar to one of them. Common decency ought to constrain such officious economists to hold their peace, or to substantiate their charges. But the modest gentlemen who murmur at this expense, without ever feeling it, seem never to advert to the profit side of the question—to the expenses which the Bible will prevent, and to the clear gains which it will insure. The single vice of intemperance costs this nation more, in five years, than would be required to send the Bible to every family in the world. It levies, directly or indirectly, an annual tax upon our people of \$120,000,000. And pray, worthy gentlemen, what good does intemperance achieve? Would it not be better, on the whole, to purchase Bibles and give them away, than to buy whisky and get drunk? This is only one item. Tell us, if you can, the annual expense of gambling, of horse-racing, of the pauperism

and disease occasioned by vice—of fashionable and vulgar follies in a thousand forms—of the militia system—of jails and prisons and the whole array of criminal law and justice—and your arithmetic will be exhausted in the enumeration of the hundreds of millions now thrown away to encourage, to pamper, to restrain, and to punish the wicked propensities of our citizens:—all of which will disappear whenever, and wherever, the Bible shall reign in all its celestial energy and glory. How cheap a remedy then is within our reach.

Finally—the Bible, when thoroughly studied and obeyed, will make *honest men* of priests, lawyers, editors and politicians: who have hitherto contrived to hold in bondage the great mass of the people; or it will enable the people to effectuate their own emancipation. It will put down the despotism of priestcraft, and the priestcraft of despotism; will subdue or exterminate that antichristian spirit of intolerant exclusiveness and persecuting bigotry which still lurks in the strongholds of every Christian church, and which sways the temper and conduct of a large majority of every Christian denomination. It will prevent, in our country, that unhallowed union of Church and State, which is so much dreaded just now, and which is undoubtedly aimed at, not by the genuine followers of Christ, but by crafty infidels, wily politicians and ambitious sectaries—by the very parties who have raised the fiercest clamour and preferred the heaviest charges against the friends and distributors of the Bible.

The Christian religion, as instituted by Christ and as exhibited in the New Testament, is the only religion

under heaven which never courted a State alliance— which never sought countenance or support from the civil authorities, by any species of cringing, selfish, time-serving compromise. All other religions, Pagan, Jewish, Mohammedan, have been and are incorporated with the political institutions—interwoven, as it were, into the very texture of the government of the country. Christianity entered our world, and advanced without a smile from any earthly throne, and without the aid of any military arm. It stood upon its own intrinsic merits. It challenged and sustained the severest scrutiny. It prevailed because it was true, and because God prospered it. All human governments opposed and persecuted it from the beginning, and through every stage of its early progress.

It received no imperial countenance until the reign of Constantine; and it had become the religion of the people, before that politic prince ever thought of taking it under his special protection. Constantine, like all his predecessors, whether emperors, consuls, dictators or kings, had been accustomed to regard religion as an affair of State—as an essential part of the political fabric. When, therefore, he adopted Christianity as the religion of the court and the empire, he yielded none of his royal prerogatives: but merely viewed the Christian faith as a substitute for paganism, and continued to exercise over its forms and tenets the same species of arbitrary control. His example has been followed throughout the Christian world—and ever since this first bold act of imperial usurpation, Christianity has been compelled to

wear the livery and to speak the language of earthly courts and despots.

But the gospel is not responsible for this abuse of its plainest precepts—for this egregious perversion of its genuine spirit. Its divine author had, on all occasions, disclaimed any pretensions to worldly power, wealth or influence. He promptly checked every ambitious desire of his followers—and repeatedly told them that his kingdom was not of this world. He commanded them to obey the existing civil powers—to render unto Cæsar the things which were Cæsar's, (Matt. xxii. 21)—tribute to whom tribute, and honour to whom honour was due, (Rom. xiii. 7)—to keep themselves separate and unspotted from the world and to be clothed with humility. No candid reader of the New Testament could ever imagine that the disciples of the meek and lowly Jesus would become ambitious political demagogues, or aspiring courtly sycophants. It is impossible that they should. They virtually renounce their faith by the very act. They betray their insincerity, their unbelief, their hypocrisy, by every such attempt.

Christianity, no doubt, has been converted into an instrument or pretext for all manner of cruelty, fraud and oppression. But all these evils are ascribable, not to Christianity, but to the abuse of it—to infidelity in fact, wearing the Christian garb, and affecting Christian sanctity for the vilest and most iniquitous purposes. Satan himself, we are assured, often chooses to appear as an angel of light, the more effectually to deceive the unwary. Thus infidelity, in every age, has best suc-

ceeded in the assumed character of heavenly wisdom. It has thus most completely blinded and imposed on the world by its specious zeal and sanctimonious observances. When, therefore, men declaim about the dangerous influence of the Christian religion, let them substitute the term *infidelity*. The Christian religion never endangered any human right, privilege or immunity, any moral principle, or any ingredient of human happiness. False religion—infidel Christianity—has endangered all these; and often prevailed to the enslaving of the people. Infidel ecclesiastic politicians and infidel political ecclesiastics have, in all ages and in most countries, under some pretended or usurped Christian authority, succeeded in exalting themselves, and in humbling and degrading the multitude.

Popular ignorance may be assigned as the radical cause of all this enormity. An ignorant people will always be liable to imposition in some form; and that form, best adapted to the purpose aimed at, will always be assumed by the unprincipled and ambitious. Were it as fashionable and as effectual to court the populace by extraordinary demonstrations of sanctity, in our country, as it is by hollow professions of patriotism and devotion to their interests,—every popular demagogue would presently be transformed into a popular saint—and every *stump speech* would be a puritanical sermon. The man would not be changed in the least. He would merely have changed his mode of cheating the people. He would be a praying, preaching, canting demagogue, instead of being a swearing, swaggering, bullying, duelling, whisky-treating

demagogue. In the one case, he might become, like Peter the Hermit, the leader of a modern crusade against the possessors of some new land of golden promise; or, like Cromwell, become the saintly Protector of the lives, and liberties, and purses of the nation. In the other, he merely accommodates himself to the prevailing humour and follies of the times, and plays the Clodius or Catiline for the same meritorious ends. There is no honesty—no moral principle—in either case.

Again, the object of notoriety, or worldly distinction, may be secured—when the popular sentiment favours—by a course of open, undisguised, downright, malignant infidelity. And the man, who, in one age or country, might have aspired to be an orthodox persecuting Pope or Cardinal, may, in another, be equally gratified in becoming a skeptical, scoffing Voltaire or Paine. So long as political distinctions—civil offices—continue to be the principal objects of ambitious pursuit in our country,—so long will the aspirants to office persevere in courting and flattering the people in order to reach them; and the system will vary with every change in the popular feeling.

Religion, whether true or false, Christian or infidel, has ever proved a most efficient engine in exciting and inflaming the popular mind—and with what tremendous effect it has been frequently wielded, let history tell. How often has the desperate adventurer rode triumphant into the high places of power and splendour amidst the storms and tempests occasioned by religious frenzy and fanaticism? How often has the cunning politician, in

seasons of religious fervour, put on all the sombre pious exterior of a pharisee of the strictest sect, and made long prayers in the corners of the streets and in the public markets, to be seen of men and to be rewarded by their homage?

The pharisees of old, we happen to know, were the popular favourites of their day, and were universally admired and revered for their imposing piety: while Christ himself was, at the same time, accounted a glutton and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners. The same kind of ostentatious religion takes with the people still. They are captivated with a grand display of religion; with eloquent and earnest and pathetic prayers and sermons; with loud and angry and authoritative denunciations of all plain matter-of-fact men, who choose to think that religion is an every-day concern, which ought to be manifested in every action of life, as well as at set times and on set occasions. They are delighted with a furious exterminating zeal, which would unchurch, excommunicate and gibbet all who do not exactly pronounce every prescribed *shibboleth* of the dominant party; with all that affectation of humility which obtrudes itself upon the vulgar gaze by the mere trickery of external singularities; while the pride and ambition of a thousand Wolseys lurk within the bosom of the popular saint.

If, then, my hearers, you dread the approaches of priestly domination—of ecclesiastical despotism—of political pharisaism—be up and doing without delay. Scatter the light of divine truth far and wide over

this free and happy land. Religious liberty has never existed in any other land. Here, the grand experiment is now making for the first time, to ascertain whether religion can be maintained in any form, or to any salutary extent, without the tender mercies of the civil ruler—without a kirk or church establishment. Let us boldly persevere in this experiment: regardless of the sneers, and predictions, and ominous anticipations and fears and wishes of all transatlantic friends and foes. If we are true to ourselves—to our country—and to our God, the experiment will succeed gloriously. But, without the Bible, there will be no religion,—and no security against the sinister machinations of the selfish, the artful, the ambitious, of every name and form.

Every enemy of the Bible is, whether conscious of it or not, an enemy to civil and religious liberty, and to all the dearest rights of man. Infidelity is always ambitious, intolerant, persecuting and tyrannical. When priests begin to oppose the circulation of the Bible, you may be sure it is because their craft is in danger. When priests, in our country, seek to withhold the Bible from the people, you may set them down as fairly enlisted in the traitorous project of effecting a union of Church and State—as aiming at an ecclesiastical supremacy over the consciences, the fortunes and the persons of the people. By their actions, ye may know them.

I am aware that Bible Societies have been objected to, as forming a part of that grand religious conspiracy which is said to be already at work in sapping the foundations of our whole political fabric. The charges and the calum-

nies of sheer ignorance or malignity it is impossible to confute or repel. It is very true that combination is strength: and that union of counsel and effort is necessary to effect any important object whatever. Solitary man is feeble and powerless—and, I may add, useless. Wicked men, artful men, ambitious men, have always understood this matter perfectly: and hence they diligently labour to concentrate the affections, the zeal, the wealth, and the physical force of the multitude upon their favourite schemes and enterprises. We have associated professedly for a *good* object. If we have either been ourselves deceived, or attempted to deceive others, let our credulity and our hypocrisy and our deeds of darkness be duly exposed; and let us fall beneath the indignant frowns of an insulted and injured community. We crave no indulgence—and we dread no scrutiny.

This *good* work, as we believe it to be, of distributing the Bible to the destitute, was first systematically undertaken, about twenty-five years ago, by the British and Foreign Bible Society—the parent of all similar institutions.

Of the history, statistics, transactions, peculiar objects and advantages of Bible Societies, I discoursed, at large, at a former anniversary of this society.

The American Bible Society, at their annual meeting in May, 1829, resolved to supply every destitute family in the United States with a Bible in two years from that time.

Our Bible Society, heartily approving the noble resolution of the Parent Institution, and being desirous to

share the honour of carrying it into effect, have determined to spare no reasonable efforts to offer the Bible to every family in Davidson County and throughout *Middle Tennessee*, within the current year—or sooner if practicable.

Upon these subjects also, in their various bearings and applications to ourselves and others, I had the honour to address a considerable audience of my fellow-citizens, on a recent occasion: and that they were not indifferent to the calls of Christian charity, their liberal contributions at the time amply evinced. Let them not be weary in well-doing; and let others go and do likewise. I shall not repeat what I have heretofore pronounced in your hearing upon any of these topics.

The business details of our Society, as conducted by the Board of Directors, during the preceding year, will be learned from the official Report about to be read by the Secretary.

The weighty considerations and eloquent appeals, which such an occasion and such a theme might be expected to elicit, will be urged home upon your hearts and consciences by the distinguished individuals who are yet to address you. While we listen therefore to the facts and statements, to the arguments and persuasions of our honoured friends, let us try to estimate the value of that sacred treasure which we now possess. Let us conceive, if we can, what our lot might have been without the Bible—and hence learn to compassionate the unhappy condition of our fellow-men who are still strangers to its heavenly influence. What sum

of gold would tempt us deliberately to renounce or barter away forever this precious inheritance?—and take our chance for time and eternity with benighted pagans or with infatuated infidels? Have we the Bible—and can we be insensible to its blessings, or regardless of its commands? Have we yet to learn that liberality, charity, active benevolence, are as positively enjoined upon us by the great Jehovah as are the duties of justice and common honesty? That while human wants, and human woes, and human ignorance abound in our country or in our world, we are as much obligated to seek their alleviation and removal, as we are to pay our debts—as much bound to love mercy as to do justly—as much bound to feed the hungry and clothe the naked, and instruct the ignorant, and to send the gospel of salvation to the perishing, as to bring up our own children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and to provide things honest in the sight of all men for our own households?

The Bible cause, if any cause in the world can do it, may claim to unite the zeal and the exertions of all sects of Christians, without inducing one momentary feeling of suspicion, jealousy or unkindly exasperation. Here is common ground—if not neutral ground—upon which all may safely and heartily co-operate. Christians are not required to think alike, on all points, any more than to look alike. Let them differ in charity—and respect each other's scruples, peculiarities and prejudices. But if they possess the spirit of their Master they will be ever in readiness to march forth, with one heart, to the help of the Lord against the mighty.

Is it possible that Christians can pray to the great Head of the church, from day to day, “thy kingdom come,” and yet refuse to contribute an effort or a dollar towards its enlargement? That the highly-favoured Christian citizens of the wealthy and flourishing City of Nashville ought to give something to aid the great work of circulating the Bible, and of evangelizing the world—none of us, here in the presence of the heart-searching God, will dare to question. How much each individual ought to give must be left to his own conscience, and his own sense of responsibility and obligation. I judge no man. God is Judge of you and me. I upbraid no man. “To his own Master he standeth or falleth.” (Rom. xiv. 4.) I shall need indulgence in the great day, on this score, as much as any of you. None of us, in the hour of death, or before the judgment-seat of Christ, will ever imagine that we have done too much, or given away too much, in charity. Our regret will not then be, that we have loved and honoured the Bible too much, or that we have loved our fellow-men too much, or that we were too zealous in spreading the gospel, or too liberal in our benefactions to disseminate the knowledge and the blessings of heavenly truth, and wisdom, and peace, and joy, and salvation.

VINDICATION OF THE TEMPERANCE CAUSE.

[MAY 15, 1831.]

VINDICATION OF THE TEMPERANCE CAUSE.*

AT the request of the Tennessee Temperance Society, I appear before you this day as the advocate of temperance and of temperance associations. I should certainly have declined the task on this occasion, as I had done at other times, on the ground that many individuals, more highly gifted and better fitted for the work, could have been easily prevailed on to officiate, did I not apprehend that my silence might, at length, be construed into indifference or hostility to the cause itself. I felt the difficulty of meeting any reasonable expectations in discoursing on a subject so thoroughly exhausted by the numerous able essays and eloquent addresses which have been written, and spoken, and published in every corner of our land—which seemed to preclude the hope of exciting interest or of commanding attention by even the semblance of novelty, in any mode of argument or illustration which might be adopted. I was not insensible also to the extreme delicacy of the undertaking, which would require no mean share of prudence and tact to discuss the subject fairly and fully without giving offence. I knew that a large majority of my hearers

* An Address delivered before the Tennessee State Temperance Society, May 15, 1831.

had already listened to the most powerful appeals to their reason and conscience upon this momentous theme—and that many were familiar with the luminous and masterly dissertations which have been recently dispersed, in every variety of form, among the people, by Tract Societies or by the periodical press. For these and other cogent reasons, I fain would have been excused from a service, which, in reference to one class, might be deemed superfluous, and to another, as idle and unavailing as all previous efforts of the kind have confessedly proved. Some men yield a ready and instinctive assent to truth whenever exhibited—while the obstinate prejudices of others cannot be overcome by any argument. The first have been already won—and is not the case of the latter utterly desperate?

The evils of intemperance had been acknowledged, exposed and deplored, in every age and country, by all sane moralists and by all good men. Genius and wisdom and piety and patriotism had been arrayed against its destructive dominion; and had laboured to emancipate a suffering world from its degrading despotism. The preacher, the lawyer, the physician, the judge, the statesman, the philanthropist, the wit, the philosopher, the satirist, the orator, the poet, had all expended their energy and their zeal in the noblest efforts to subdue or to arrest this insidious and unsatiated foe to human happiness. But what did they all achieve? How stood the case only some half-dozen short years ago? The press, the pulpit, the law, had done their utmost. The statistics of intemperance were collected and canvassed. The

most astounding and appalling facts were disclosed and proclaimed to the world. Thirty or forty thousand of our citizens annually slain by ardent spirits—three hundred thousand more in the broad road to destruction from the same cause—fifty millions of dollars annually wasted upon this dreadful poison—three-fourths of all the pauperism, crime, disease and misery of our land occasioned by intemperance—penitentiaries and prisons and hospitals and almshouses and lunatic asylums crowded with its victims—mothers and children beggared, deserted, ruined by drunken husbands and fathers—the whole aspect of society deformed, bloated, repulsive, hideous—the thirst for the maddening bowl becoming every day stronger and more general—sots to be met with at every turn in every village, and almost in every family—the most temperate parent scarcely daring to hope that all his sons would escape the universal contagion, and accounting himself fortunate even if he should be blessed with one sober son to sustain and cheer him in his old age, and to close his eyes at last upon this world of sorrow and disappointment. In a word—

The gloom of despair seemed to gather over the future—and to fasten upon the heart of philanthropy. What shall be done to stem the torrent? was the universal inquiry. The drunkard's case was conceded to be desperate. His reformation was hopeless. Friendship, affection, reason, religion, pride, honour, had warned, entreated, threatened, importuned, in vain. He was, by common consent, abandoned to his fate. Society renounced its claims upon him as a citizen and a man.

His estate, his family, his reputation were regarded as in fearful jeopardy—as soon as it was whispered that he had begun to tipple, or to visit the tavern or grogshop. I well remember—for I was born and brought up in a land of distilleries and drunkards,—how the grave and pious old people used to converse about, and to lament over, the failings of one and another of their once thriving, prosperous and respectable neighbours—whose fondness for *strong drink* was just beginning to be known or suspected. And invariably, the unfortunate party was, by every voice, set down as ruined. The sons of the best men in the community often fell a prey to the prevailing vice. No father, as I have already intimated, however wise, or cautious, or sober, or religious, felt assured that his sons would not disgrace his name and bring down his gray hairs with sorrow to the grave, by lives of intemperance. The danger was imminent—the tempter was ever at the door—and every individual met him in every company and on all occasions. At marriages, at christenings, at funerals, at elections, at militia musters, at independence celebrations, at public festivals, at private entertainments, at dinner, at supper, in the workshop, in the field, at home, abroad, in winter, in summer, at the tavern, when travelling by land or by water, in all places, at all times,—brandy, whisky, ardent spirit in some enticing form or other, was always at hand—and there was never wanting the urgent invitation of interest or hospitality to partake of the intoxicating beverage. So that America—old America at least—was not undeservedly stigmatized by foreigners as a land

of drunkards. How could it have been otherwise? Fashion prescribed the universal use of spirit as an article of necessity among all sorts of labourers, and of hospitable entertainment at every social party and friendly meeting.

Under these circumstances, the wonder was that any mortal should pass the fiery ordeal unharmed. And yet it seems never to have occurred to our frugal sires, that this constant exposure of their children to the sight, smell and taste of inebriating liquors, would naturally produce a generation of sots; that they were in fact training their children precisely as if they designed them to become drunkards: that their own temperate drinking was the sole cause of all the calamities which they dreaded and lamented.

At length, however, the obvious cause of the evil in question was conjectured—was acknowledged—was proclaimed—was accredited by the world,—and measures were soon taken to apply the remedy.

Now, among all the discoveries inventions and improvements of this wonderful age, I venture to assert that this single discovery of a radical cure and preventive of intemperance is the grandest and most invaluable that has yet been made, and that it will distinguish the period in which we live more signally than any or all others put together.

Discoveries in practical morality are always rare and difficult—and a revolution in popular customs, usages and habits can never be effected except by absolute authority, or by the overwhelming majesty and omnipo-

tent energy of truth, when allowed to speak in her own persuasive and eloquent language, to the common sense, to the interests, and to the hearts of intelligent reflecting men.

What then was the marvellous discovery to which we have alluded, and from which we anticipate such transcendent benefits? Simply this: that the moderate and temperate use of ardent spirits was the fatal cause of all the intemperance in the world; and that entire, absolute, universal abstinence from distilled liquors was the only effectual remedy and preventive of the mischief. But how was the remedial or preventive system to be rendered efficient or commensurate with the evil? Was it enough to promulgate the new doctrine from the press and the pulpit? Would it have sufficed to have commissioned heralds to preach a crusade throughout the land against intemperance—or against the *temperate* use of ardent spirits? No such thing. Our enlightened sages judged more wisely. They knew that individual effort could accomplish little—comparatively nothing. They therefore sought for strength—for the requisite moral power—in union, in combination, in association—in bringing the influence of numbers to bear directly and unceasingly upon the enemy until he should be routed and utterly exterminated.

A few minor associations led the van—served as pioneers—cleared the way of many obstacles—and evinced their prowess in the good work. Then followed the formation of the “American Temperance Society,” in February, 1826. Already, there are thirteen or fourteen

State Temperance Societies. The number of county, city or town associations is not less, it is believed, than 3000—and the individual members probably exceed 300,000—consisting of the best, most intelligent and most eminent men in our country. These exert an influence, more or less direct, over some two or three millions of our people. It is too late to consider the question, either of *right*, or of *expediency*, or of *beneficial* tendency. Experience has triumphantly established all these points, and dissipated all manner of doubts and objections. Still, where the system is not thoroughly understood—where it is novel—where it has been misrepresented, or imperfectly exhibited, or maliciously opposed, or sneeringly ridiculed—old objections may require a passing notice and renewed refutation.

In such places and by such persons, it is currently objected to Temperance Societies, that they are superfluous—that all men do or may know their duty—that they ought not to pledge themselves to each other to abstain from ardent spirits—that every individual should be left to the dictates of his own conscience in this, as in other matters which are not regulated by the civil law—that it is both useless and tyrannical to require of him a promise or a bond to pursue a prescribed course of duty—that the principle of total abstinence may be very correct and wise and salutary; but why all this public parade, this ostentatious notoriety, this signing of documents, this subscription to rules and codes, this invidious separation from the ranks of the people, this assumption of extraordinary dictatorial powers, this arrogant claim

to more virtue, self-denial and discretion than belong to the mass of our fellow-citizens?

This strain of remark is sufficiently obvious and plausible—but carries no force with it to sensible considerate men. It is the mere cant of ignorance or obstinacy—or, at best, the specious sophistry with which a certain description of the community are willing to satisfy their own scruples and to delude and pacify others.

Man is a social animal. All his power—all his enjoyments—all his virtues and all his vices—result from association. As an individual, he is powerless, helpless, useless. He becomes strong and mighty and invincible, only by associating with his fellows. His capacity for good or for evil is just in proportion to the influence which he can exert over others. Thus it is that the ambitious man, the benevolent man, the good man, and the wicked man, succeed in revolutionizing, in adorning and elevating, or in degrading the character and condition of mankind.

Are we assailed by a potent enemy, and shall we not unite in resisting him? Has this enemy, by intrigue or stratagem, by artifice or violence, gained possession of our strongholds and high places—and is he already, without feeling or remorse, swaying the sceptre of despotism over a deceived, misguided and suffering people? And shall we tamely, silently, slavishly, endure the bondage—or boldly resolve to rise in mass upon our oppressors, and live free or die? Is any man so cowardly as to counsel passive obedience, non-resistance, noiseless uncomplaining resignation? or so infatuated as to pro-

pose that every man should decide and act for himself, at such a juncture, without reference to his neighbour, or to the general welfare?

Now, intemperance, countenanced in its remote and approximate cause, as it long has been, by public opinion—reigning and rioting, as it were, by the prescription of a thousand years—is precisely such a foe, and is exercising precisely such an absolute despotism throughout our land. This tyranny cannot be broken down by the opinions, or efforts, or example of isolated individuals. Against this deadly and insidious and merciless oppressor, a well-disciplined army must be raised and equipped and marched into the field to do battle. The patriot soldier must come forth from the enemy's camp, and enlist under the banner of the patriot captain. He must swear fealty to the cause of freedom and reform—and if he prove false, be branded as a traitor.

The empire of intemperance is to be demolished—and the friends of humanity are beating up for volunteers to establish upon its ruins the republic of temperance. A battle is to be fought. We want soldiers. Who will enlist? We have large bounty to offer at the outset—and rich rewards when the victory is achieved. Honour, peace, prosperity, health, long life, wealth, fair lands, good crops, liberty, happiness, a flourishing commonwealth, and a grateful posterity, will attend and remunerate all who serve to the end of the war. Success need never be doubted. Stout hearts, pure hands, a good cause, honest purpose, determined perseverance, will, with the divine blessing, insure a glorious triumph.

Let us calculate, a moment, the chances on this subject. We see the nature of our present position. We are encompassed by a host of whisky manufacturers, of whisky venders, and of whisky drinkers—all of whom are conscious of the folly and wickedness of drinking to excess—and two-thirds of them, if not the remaining third, are perfectly aware that even moderate drinking does much harm and no good. Every labouring man feels this to be by far the heaviest tax with which he is burdened—but he dares not infringe the statutes which arbitrary custom has ordained. Would *he* be disobliged if these onerous statutes were repealed or abrogated forever? Or if this were done against his will, would his family, his wife and children, be disobliged by such a measure?

I mean not to denounce or inveigh against the habitual drunkard. Towards him I cherish no sentiments but those of sympathy and compassion. The usages of his country have undone him. A whisky drinking community must share the blame, the sin and the infamy which attach to his deplorable lot—and be, in a great measure, if not altogether, responsible for his wretchedness.

Nor will I rail at the whisky maker or the whisky seller. These too are sustained, encouraged and fostered by the same whisky drinking public. But for the latter, the former could not exist a moment. Their craft is at an end, whenever the people cease to reward it: or it will seek the covert of midnight darkness as soon as the public countenance shall frown upon it.

But there are many who do not drink whisky at all

—who see all the dangers and evils and horrors of the practice—whose experience and observation, whose reading and reflection, have convinced them that ardent spirits, when used ever so moderately, in any degree or in any form, are injurious to health, to morals, to intellect, and all the dearest interests of individuals and of society. I am sure that not a few of my present hearers are fully persuaded on these points, and that their practice accords with their convictions. From such men, we shall not expect either opposition or neutrality or lukewarmness. If they have not yet enrolled their names in the books of the great national army of freemen, it must be because they have hitherto had no opportunity of doing it. They will be eager to approve themselves openly before the world what they profess to be in private—the conscientious, intrepid, undaunted friends and champions of temperance.

When I commenced this discourse, I probably took too much for granted. The case seemed so clear—the subject so hackneyed—that I nearly resolved to avoid all details and all elaborate argument—because to one portion of my hearers it would be an old story, and upon another, a mere waste of words. But, perhaps, there are some who are still doubtful and wavering, and halting between two opinions—who have read little and thought less upon the subject—and who are yet open to conviction. In addressing a sentence or two to such persons, I would be understood as aiming at nothing more than suggesting a few hints to induce further investigation and reflection.

The deleterious and poisonous nature of alcohol,—as ardent spirit, in its purest undiluted form, is styled,—remained, in a great measure, unknown and unsuspected until recently. Modern science has ascertained its genuine character and properties. In many useful arts it is a valuable, perhaps necessary agent—and for this purpose it will continue to be manufactured when it shall have ceased to be used as a drink. From the *materia medica* it has not yet been excluded,—and whether it will or ought to be thus excluded absolutely, must be left with the learned faculty to decide. One point, however, has been definitely and irrevocably settled, namely: that except as a medicine, and when prescribed by a very honest and very skilful physician, ardent spirit ought never to come in contact with the lips of mortal man—nor of woman either!

The chemist, the physiologist, the physician—both of Europe and America—have, by their recent researches and publications, shed a flood of light upon this curious and interesting, though melancholy and revolting subject. However prone to differ, and to dispute, and to dogmatize upon other topics—they all harmoniously agree in proscribing ardent spirit, and co-operate heart and hand in their benevolent endeavours to banish it alike from the palace and the cottage—from the workshop and the farm—from the army and the navy—from the land and the ocean. They have done, too, what many preachers have failed to do. They have strictly conformed their own lives to their doctrines. They have set the example of total abstinence. In many

parts of our country, medical societies have, by a unanimous vote, become temperance societies—and solemnly bound themselves to promote the cause of temperance among others to the utmost of their ability.

I feel no small degree of patriotic pride in having so legitimate an occasion to pay a well merited tribute of praise to the medical profession of my country, for their generous, noble, disinterested, judicious, philanthropic and successful efforts in behalf of degraded suffering humanity. To appreciate the value of their services—conceive, if you can, what might have been the result, had the weight of their influence, talents, learning, zeal and ingenuity been thrown into the opposite scale. Had they even been neutral, indifferent, inactive, silent; or merely witty and playful about the matter—had they represented whisky as harmless, or as noxious only when immoderately used; or, as some *pious* folks express it, as one of God's creatures which could not have been made in vain, and therefore must have been designed for their own special comfort—or had they sneered at the cold water drinkers, as is the fashion with sundry of our *exquisite* witlings and *electioneering* oracles—or had they deemed it quite enough to take care of themselves individually, and to leave their neighbours undisturbed and unalarmed, as multitudes of our more wary sages profess to think is the better course—what would have been the aspect of the temperance cause at this day? Verily, future generations shall rise up and call them blessed.

They have manifested no cowardice, no hypocrisy, no selfishness, no temporizing policy, no balancing of petty

claims and interests, no cautious calculations about popular opinion, no *prudent* reserve or hesitation as to the plan or measures to be adopted—they have come forward boldly and manfully against the common enemy, and have unequivocally and professionally declared that the most temperate use of ardent spirit has been and is the prolific and exclusive source of all the direful calamities with which intemperance has cursed and blasted our once fair and happy land. Were it not invidious, I could cite a long list of illustrious names, with the immortal Rush at their head, who have discussed this subject in all its bearings, and whose testimony and reasoning could not fail to carry conviction home to the heart of the most skeptical and ignorant.

From an address before a temperance society of one of them—being the latest which has fallen into my hands—I quote the following brief passage as a specimen.

The learned and pious author—a physician and a professor in a medical college—having treated of the effects of ardent spirit on the physical powers, at considerable length, under eight distinct heads—proceeds thus:—

“But time would fail me, were I to attempt an account of half the pathology of drunkenness. *Dyspepsia, jaundice, emaciation, corpulence, dropsy, ulcers, rheumatism, gout, tremors, palpitation, hysteria, epilepsy, palsy, lethargy, apoplexy, melancholy, madness, delirium tremens, and premature old age,* compose but a small part of the catalogue of diseases produced by ardent spirit. Indeed, there is scarcely a morbid affection to which the human body is liable, that has not, in one way or another, been pro-

duced by it; there is not a disease but it has aggravated, nor a predisposition to disease, which it has not called into action; and although its effects are in some degree modified by age and temperament, by habit and occupation, by climate and season of the year, and even by the intoxicating agent itself; yet, the general and ultimate consequences are the same.”*

It is, indeed, a universally admitted maxim among scientific physicians, contrary to the vulgar opinion on the subject, that the habitual use of ardent spirit generates a predisposition to disease and death. So that, other things being equal, the drunkard is more liable to be affected by any exposure to infection or contagion, to heat or cold, to humidity or malaria, or to any of the ten thousand accidents and maladies which flesh is heir to, than the sober man. Ardent spirit, so far from protecting the system, always renders it more obnoxious to decay and dissolution from all the agents which Providence has ordained for its eventual destruction. So far, then, from being a preventive of disease, or an antidote to pestilential miasmata, or the elixir of life, it is directly and invariably the reverse.

Physicians have shown, too, how certainly and fearfully the intellectual and moral faculties are enfeebled, degraded, and, at length, extinguished, under the same baleful influence.

I might, moreover, direct the inquirer to the records of crime—to the statistics of prisons and penitentiaries—to the published statements and declarations of our

* Dr. Thomas Sewall, p. 14.

ablest judges and prosecuting attorneys—for ample evidence to demonstrate the wide-spread havoc, the overwhelming desolation, occasioned by intemperance—which is itself, be it remembered, engendered and nurtured by the *temperate* use of inebriating liquors. No pencil can adequately delineate the wretchedness of a single widowed or deserted mother, or of a single neglected off-cast orphan, whose husband or father has been doomed to the ignominy of a dungeon or the gallows,—to say nothing of the horrible fate of the guilty sufferer himself. Who then shall attempt to portray the agonies endured by the thousands of mothers, children, relations and friends of the condemned and ruined victims of legal justice—after having become the reckless victims of intemperance?

Who can describe the wo—the bitterness of anguish—of an honourable father—of a tender affectionate mother—when they contemplate the bloated ruins of a once promising, ingenuous, dutiful and talented son? In childhood and youth, he was amiable and lovely—at school, he was docile and studious; and the buddings of genius were obvious to every eye, and the parental bosom fondly cherished the delusive hope of future eminence, surpassing even the brightest visions which so fair a beginning seemed to indicate. But the youth was social and generous—he was caressed and flattered—of the festive board and the gay circle he was the life and soul—he participated, without check or restraint, in the usual amusements and pleasures of the sphere in which he moved. By degrees he learned to

relish the inspiring draught which was ever at hand—occasionally, he would, with his jovial companions, indulge in excess—and thus, almost imperceptibly, the incipient taste grew into a confirmed habit, before he had ripened into manhood, or entered upon the serious pursuits of active life or professional ambition.

I need not follow him, step by step, to the inevitable catastrophe which awaits him. The steps, indeed, are few and rapid. Incapacitated for success in any honourable vocation,—too proud to grovel in the lowest ranks of vagrancy and penury—unable to struggle against the tide of ill fortune which is bearing him onward, or to regain, by decision and perseverance, his forfeited character and self-respect—he yields all, at length, to the subtle tempter—and, by one bold act of desperate villainy,—of embezzlement, of fraud, of theft, of robbery, of murder, it may be—he falls to rise no more!—The prey and the spoil of youthful intemperance! Our world—our country—has furnished many such an instance.

I have seen scores of just such youth in college—in Eastern colleges—in the land of steady habits, of Bibles, churches, and gospel ministers—where, by-the-way, all is not gold that glitters—I have seen them, when they first began to sip the savoury medicated and half-disguised inebriating potion, and steadily advancing from weaker to stronger, until they could swallow, without a nervous twinge, or muscular movement, or moral scruple, the raw gin and brandy and whisky of the shops—I have seen them habitual incurable sots at twenty, and in their

graves at twenty-five. Others, again, have not lived so fast, and therefore have lived longer. But they lived only to squander their property, to disgrace their family, to break the hearts of their doting parents, and to curse society. They may have escaped the jail and the gibbet—but they have amply scourged the guilty generation which tolerated the abomination by which they were thus cloven down, or converted into fiends, in the morning of their days.

Is there a father or a mother in this assembly so blind, so infatuated, so insensible, so abandoned, as still to countenance and to uphold a usage so fraught with horror, so productive of crime and ruin and infamy and despair? Let me solemnly admonish such father or mother, that, if ever a son of theirs shall become a drunkard, they will have made him a drunkard. I am speaking not of the past, but of the future. The times of this universal ignorance and delusion, God winked at or permitted—but *now* he commandeth all men everywhere to repent—and to escape, not merely the deep gulf of perdition, but to turn aside altogether from the great highway which leads to it. In former days, parents destroyed their children without suspecting it. They threw them into the very jaws of the all-devouring Moloch—as if a miracle were to be wrought for their deliverance. They constantly and pertinaciously led them into temptation, at the very period, perhaps, when they were assiduously teaching them to offer up to their Heavenly Father, morning and evening, on bended knee, the beautiful, significant and most appropriate

petition—"lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil."

They made, and bought, and sold, and drank whisky—as, only a few years previously, they stole, and bought, and sold African men, women, and children—without remorse—without one compunctious visiting of conscience—without a single misgiving of spirit, or faltering of tongue, even when engaged in prayer to a God of justice, purity and mercy, or when seated at the communion table and commemorating the dying love of their benevolent and compassionate Saviour, or when in the pulpit, proclaiming peace on earth, and good will to men.

How or wherefore, Christian men, with the Bible of eternal truth and equity in their hands, should have remained thus blinded and besotted for centuries, is a problem which human philosophy can never solve. But now, upon both these enormities—namely, the slave-trade and the whisky-trade, the light of Heaven has beamed: and wo—wo—wo—to the monster who shall henceforth dare to infringe the law of righteousness and temperance which this heavenly light has enabled all to read and to understand!

If the political economist—the patriot statesman—the sagacious politician—were consulted on this subject—they would tell us that the millions annually expended on ardent spirit by the consumer—that is, by the community at large, is so much dead loss to the nation—as much lost as if the whole had been buried in the ocean. And this, they would prove beyond the

possibility of doubt or mistake. I think it can be made as evident as that two and two are equal to four; I submit the case of an individual; I suppose him to purchase a gallon of whisky per week, for his own consumption, at the price of fifty cents. I suppose it moreover to be conceded, that the drinking of said whisky will not add to his wealth or welfare in any degree. If so, then he might burn or throw away his gallon of whisky—or he might have buried his fifty cents in the earth or the ocean—without being a whit the poorer than if he had drunk his whisky. What is thus true of one individual in reference to a single gallon or a single gill of spirit, is equally true of every individual, and of all the individuals who compose the nation, in reference to every portion and to the whole amount of distilled liquors consumed. Every man may throw away his own share—the whole nation may throw away the sum total of these shares,—without detriment to the individual or the nation,—consequently, the *money* might just as well have been thrown away, before it was thus exchanged for whisky, and the loss would be no greater in the one case than in the other. That is, the loss would be equal in both cases. It would be absolute—total—irremediable.

I am speaking now simply of the consumer—the drinker of whisky. The annual consumption of whisky, or of ardent spirits in various forms, was estimated at fifty or sixty millions of gallons—and to exceed in value fifty millions of dollars. I shall not stop to ask what *good* these millions might be made to achieve. Nor do

I now take into the account the train of positive evils which the consumption of whisky always inflicts. I have enlarged on these already. I assert that every dollar expended in this nation on ardent spirit by the consumer, is, to all intents and purposes, annihilated. The whole might as well be expended on gunpowder to be exploded in an instant — and infinitely better, if the moral and physical effects be considered.

Who then is benefited? The manufacturer and vender — apparently. Granted, for a moment. *How* are they benefited? By contributing directly to the impoverishment, degradation, infamy and death of their brothers and sons and wives and daughters and neighbours and fellow-citizens. By ministering and pandering to human vice and folly and ignorance. By converting a peaceful, virtuous, thriving community into a herd of wallowing swine — of idle vagabonds and paupers — of swindlers and cut-throats. Is this an occupation which an honourable man should live by — or which a Christian man would choose to die by? But the political economist would readily satisfy even this class that their capital might be much more profitably invested, as soon as the people should cease to crave and to drink ardent spirit. The people would then be temperate, — and, probably, industrious and frugal, — they would earn or produce more than formerly, and consequently would have more, in addition to the sum previously wasted on whisky, wherewith to purchase the comforts and necessaries of life. It is the interest of all therefore to make the people sober —

and then the whisky traffic, except for the arts and medicine, will be at an end.

Suppose now that all the people in Davidson County should, from this day forward, cease to drink ardent spirit—would our merchants, or farmers, or mechanics be losers by their abstinence? They would, to a man, be immense gainers.

The poor labourer who now goes regularly to the grocery for his quart of whisky, which is often never paid for, would then go for twice as much coffee, tea, sugar and other articles, as he at present allows his family—and he would pay punctually for the whole into the bargain. And so of the rest. The distiller, of course, would betake himself to some more honest, lucrative and useful employment. Industry and capital, if skilfully directed, will always create both a market and a supply. The dealer in whisky is no more essential to the pecuniary well-being of a community, than is the gambler, the libertine or the pirate.

Such is an outline of the political economist's lecture.

Now what says the planter or farmer, who cultivates the soil by slaves or hired labourers? Does he not get along better without whisky than with it? Thousands have answered, emphatically, yes. Manufacturers, mechanics, merchants, who have no inebriating liquor on their premises, have affirmed the same thing. Captains and masters of ships and steamboats have discovered that whisky is the very worst commodity which they can put aboard their vessels; and hundreds navigate seas and oceans, and lakes and rivers without it. Mili-

tary chieftains too are beginning to acknowledge that soldiers may perform their duty in the camp, or face the enemy in battle, without the stimulus of whisky much more efficiently than with it. Even lawyers and divines seem pretty generally convinced that they can counsel and plead and write and preach more to the benefit and edification of their clients and hearers, by observing than by violating the rules of the most rigid temperance. Nay, publicans and grocers have, in many instances, succeeded in pursuing their vocations and in maintaining their establishments upon the same principle.

The experiment, indeed, has been tried, I believe, by some of every class and description of men in the world—and I have yet to learn that a single failure or disappointment has been witnessed.

In our country, the change already effected, if it had been predicted ten years ago, would have been pronounced impossible without a miracle. It is, indeed, the most astonishing moral phenomenon ever witnessed in our world. Temperance associations have achieved not only vastly more than they anticipated, but what they never dared to hope for. They have reclaimed hundreds of actual drunkards.* This is like raising the dead to life. Could I paint the joy, the gratitude, the ecstasy of one poor, disconsolate, broken-hearted, lovely wife, on beholding the wretched degraded husband of her youthful affections restored to himself again,

* "Seven hundred *confirmed sots* are reported as restored to respectable society in two years;" three thousand reclaimed. (See last Report for 1831.)

and with renovated spirit, striving, by every kindly attention and assiduous effort, to atone for the past and to insure her future happiness—you would, by acclamation, declare, that, were this the only result, temperance societies had been amply and gloriously rewarded for all their labours.

But thousands who were in the broad road to, and upon the very verge of, intemperance, have been arrested and saved. While hundreds of thousands of our youth have been or will be spared the danger of even a partial encounter with the foe. The wily tempter will never approach them—strong drink will never entice them. Their fathers and neighbours have banished it from their tables and houses. Many towns and villages have exterminated the monster utterly from their limits. Others have abated three-fourths, or one-half, or one-third of the evil. The whisky despotism is everywhere yielding to the omnipotence of public opinion—and like every other species of despotism, it must speedily disappear forever from the land of the enlightened, the united, and the brave.

Yes, enlightened and united, we can conquer any and every foe. Say but the word, and we are freemen. The galling, damning yoke of whisky bondage shall not be endured another hour—if we but resolve it. Here is a cause in which all persons of every political party, of every religious sect, of every age and rank and sex; may cordially co-operate for their own and for the public weal.

By voluntary association we can do what we please. We can put down every sort of visible and offensive vice.

We can encourage every species of valuable industry, and render the practice of any virtue fashionable and popular. We need not the strong arm of arbitrary power to coerce the refractory or the unprincipled. Let those who give the tone to public opinion in all things, set the example of self-denial, of universal and total abstinence from ardent spirits, and the rest of the people will cheerfully follow it.

It will be perceived that I have hitherto limited my condemnatory remarks exclusively to *distilled* liquors. It was necessary that the advocates of the temperance reformation should, at the outset, draw a clear and definite line of demarcation between certain kinds of intoxicating liquids; that there might be no ground for mistake or uncertainty or evasion or plausible hostility, in regard to this grand enterprise. They therefore wisely determined to aim at the entire banishment or prohibition only of spirituous or distilled liquors, in contradistinction to all sorts of fermented liquors, such as wine, beer and cider—leaving the disposition of the latter to the sound discretion and enlightened conscience of every individual. The former, it was well ascertained, were never beneficial, but always deleterious, and therefore might and ought to be forever expunged from the list of lawful drinks. It was moreover ascertained that fermented liquors, where ardent spirits do not abound, or are not in general use, never occasion or increase the evil of intemperance. Thus, for instance, in countries where wine is the common beverage of the people, intoxication seldom occurs, and habitual drunkenness is never wit-

nessed. It remains to be seen whether beer and cider may be used as freely and as safely in Britain and America as is wine in France and Italy. (That is, after ardent spirits shall be excluded from the former—for wherever ardent spirit is easily procurable, there, ale and cider, and even wine, seem to serve rather as incentives to its use than as a substitute.) But if not, and if our people must and will have something stronger and more exhilarating than pure water, there are two modes of gratifying their taste or their caprice, without resorting to the distillery.

In the first place:—The lighter and cheaper wines of the South of Europe may be imported in almost any quantity for which there shall be a demand; and if the present high duty were removed, as it ought to be, and as Mr. Jefferson long ago recommended that it should be for this very purpose, then every poor man might have his bottle of wine at less cost than a bottle of whisky.

In the second place:—The culture of the vine among ourselves, (and we might cultivate a hundred different species of the grape, both native and foreign, with perfect ease,) would soon enable us to manufacture good wine to any desirable extent—so that it might become as plentiful and cheap as cider is in the Northern and Middle States.

I would not be understood as encouraging the use of wine, or as expressing any opinion on the subject. I am aware that many of our best citizens and ablest physicians denounce it utterly; and all agree that the wines of traffic—such as the merchants usually furnish—are so

thoroughly adulterated and *brandied* as to deserve little more favour than is shown to ordinary spirit.

But I purposely wave all discussion and all details on this difficult, complex, and much controverted topic. Pure wine, temperately used, it would seem, cannot be absolutely prohibited as unlawful, because it is countenanced in Scripture and by the example of our Saviour. I think we are on the safe side, so long as we do not transcend the limits which the Deity himself has prescribed—and temperance societies do not presume to enjoin or to require any more.

It is true, indeed, that the use of ardent spirits is not forbidden in the Bible—but, then, the art of distillation is a comparatively modern invention. The canon of Scripture was completed, probably, a thousand years before it was practised. But as the use of everything hurtful to health, reason, morals, life, reputation or estate, to ourselves or others, is expressly and positively prohibited, we shall in vain recur to Scripture for even the shadow of a plea in behalf of ardent spirit.

No vice is more pointedly condemned in the Bible than drunkenness. Of course, whatever directly leads or tempts to this fatal vice is interdicted by the same high and infallible authority. If any man should discover that the use even of the weakest wine was gradually inducing the habit of excessive indulgence, he ought instantly to renounce it altogether. This is the doctrine of common sense, of natural religion, no less than of revelation. The habitual use, then, of pure

unadulterated wine, or of any similar fermented liquor, may be innocent, because harmless, in one case, and sinful, because pernicious, in another.

Again, if the use of wine by any individual, should prove the occasion of stumbling or offence to others, then he ought immediately to abstain. Thus, the Apostle Paul declared that he would never eat flesh, if it should give offence—that he would deny himself in all things indifferent or innocuous rather than offend his weaker brethren. “Wherefore (says he) if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend.” (1 Cor. viii. 13.)

And, in the same spirit, he writes in another epistle: “Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another.

“For meat destroy not the work of God. All things indeed are pure; but it is evil for that man who eateth with offence.

“It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak.” (Rom. xiv. 19, 20, 21.)

If this simple, plain and equitable apostolic rule were universally observed, as it ought to be, much idle speculation, and much practical evil would be prevented. It is undoubtedly a fundamental principle in the code of Christian ethics; and can never be departed from without guilt and danger. And if the rule apply to things otherwise indifferent or innocent—to wine and meat for example—much more will it apply to things doubtful or

generally noxious—and particularly to ardent spirit. For I venture to affirm, that, at the present day, enlightened as is the public mind on the subject, no Christian could make use of it without exciting suspicion as to the sincerity of his profession, or without giving countenance by his practice to all the multiform and horrid abuses and calamities of the grossest inebriation. Let a minister of the gospel, or any church officer or member, be seen occasionally, and with the most guarded and scrupulous moderation, to drink rum or brandy—and will not his example be urged and pleaded, and triumphantly paraded before the world, by every sot and by every habitual *temperate* drinker in the neighbourhood; as a sufficient excuse and apology for any excess?

“Wo to that man by whom the offence cometh.”

In this warfare, as in most others, there is no neutral ground—no half-way stopping house. Societies indeed have been organized for the avowed purpose of moderate or temperate drinking—*One-glass-in-the-day* societies, to regulate the evil, and to keep men within reasonable and salutary bounds. But what have these accomplished? Confessedly, in all cases, they have played into the hands of the common adversary—have encouraged and promoted the cause of intemperance—and consequently have done unspeakable mischief, and no manner of good. For “let it be engraven upon the heart of every man, that the daily use of ardent spirits, in any form, or in any degree, is intemperance.” And that habitual tippling is worse even than periodical drunkenness.

The conclusion then at which we arrive is this—that,

in reference to all fermented liquors, every individual must be left to that conscientious discretion, which a thorough, prayerful and honest study of sacred scripture will enable him to exercise, in view of his own and his neighbour's welfare, both here and hereafter—that distilled liquors can never be safely or innocently used, and therefore ought to be universally abandoned—that total abstinence is the only effectual remedy or preventive of intemperance,—that, as public sentiment has hitherto sustained and cherished the enormity, so public sentiment alone can put it down.—And hence, that it is the duty of all men without exception to come forward and publicly declare their fixed unalterable purpose to abstain from ardent spirit themselves, and to exert their utmost influence to prevail on others to follow their example, and to co-operate with them in this philanthropic and holy enterprise.

Further, if our premises be tenable, then another result is equally obvious and indisputable: namely—That it is unlawful to manufacture, or to traffic in ardent spirits for the purposes of ordinary consumption. I see no way of evading or denying this conclusion. It is as clear and direct and legitimate a deduction as was ever derived from any established or admitted data—or as can be attained by any inductive process within the sphere of moral or logical or scriptural argumentation. It would not become me, nor would it comport with my feelings, to employ harsh or abusive or censorious language in reference to a large and respectable class of my fellow-citizens, whose occupation is thus arraigned and

pronounced unlawful. Seven years ago, I was as much in darkness and error on this whole subject as any of my hearers probably are at this moment. Whether, if my private interest,—my means of procuring a livelihood,—had seemed opposed to my duty in this respect, and had blinded my moral vision, I should yet have discerned the light and yielded to the force of truth, is more than I dare affirm.—For the heart is deceitful above all things, and strangely bent on finding or inventing excuses and salvos for any practice or vocation which promises immediate worldly advantage. I therefore make great allowance for the tardy growth of conviction in the mind, when such conviction must necessarily lead to personal sacrifice or pecuniary loss.

It is easy for the perfectly abstemious man to denounce the whisky drinker—it is easy for the jurist and the divine to condemn the distiller and the retailer of whisky—because the former have nothing to surrender, no self-denial to practise—whilst the latter must relinquish a favourite gratification or a lucrative business. These and similar considerations should admonish the friends of reformation to exercise great forbearance, moderation, sympathy and charity towards all whose habits or interests are to be affected by the changes which they recommend.

But, having been providentially permitted myself to behold something of the ravages and horrors occasioned by ardent spirit—having been constrained by evidence irresistible to believe that it can never be used without abuse—and therefore that no man ought to contribute

directly or indirectly to its production or dissemination among the people—I should be chargeable with cowardice or hypocrisy were I to be silent or ambiguous on this head. So deep rooted are my own convictions of duty, that were every man in this assembly my father, brother, or intimate friend, and were all engaged in this unrighteous traffic, I could not forbear to testify against them, as I now do—solemnly, firmly, decidedly—but, at the same time, urging them with the most affectionate importunity, to give the subject a candid and thorough investigation.

Let me put the case to any father in this house—whether, if he could foresee that his beloved son would, if spared, inevitably become a grovelling, habitual, reckless sot, he would not prefer, were the option allowed him, that this son should fall suddenly, while yet in all the blooming beauty and cheering promise of youthful innocence, by the dagger of the ruthless assassin? I think I can answer for him, as I would answer for myself. Now, in the present state of our society, every youth is liable to a destiny more to be deplored, more dreadfully shocking to parental affection, than even assassination itself. He may be made a sot! Banish the tempter from our society, and no father will dread such a catastrophe.

Why—suffer me to ask—do we tolerate the scores and hundreds of licensed taverns, groceries and grog-shops, which everywhere meet the eye, only to allure and destroy the young and the unwary? Is one of them useful or necessary?—useful or necessary, I mean,

merely as furnishing ardent spirit to the people? Do travellers need poison by way of refreshment? Is this the kind of entertainment which we provide by law for the stranger and the wayfaring man when they come within our gates? The palpable absurdity and the tremendous iniquity of this whole arrangement will, in a few years, be ranked among the delusions of witchcraft, and the inquisition, and the slave-trade. Posterity will marvel at the murderous usages which our Christian fathers, as well as this enlightened Christian generation, have so long and so blindly sanctioned.

It used to be currently remarked at the East, that every new distillery was sure to raise up around it a host of miserable drunkards; and that a very considerable proportion of those who engaged in the business of manufacturing or selling ardent spirits, sooner or later, became sots themselves. I have known men, distinguished for their sobriety, industry and apparent piety, fall a sacrifice to intemperance, in a few years, after they had eagerly sought to better their fortunes as distillers or tavern keepers. Such cases were of frequent occurrence in my native State; and many an amiable, respectable and even wealthy family have I seen in mourning and in rags from this fatal pursuit of unhallowed gain. The fact is, that “the continued habit of dealing out ardent spirits, in various forms and mixtures, leads also to frequent tasting, and tasting to drinking, and drinking to tippling, and tippling to drunkenness.” Thus, in the retributions of a righteous Providence, the destroyer of others is himself destroyed, and by his own instrument-

ality. He is impoverished by the very means resorted to for wealth—and by which he had impoverished his neighbours. Well might it be inscribed, in flaming capitals, on the door of every distillery and grogshop—“This is the way to poverty and death!”

How emphatical and how practically just is the denunciation of the prophet:—“Wo unto him that giveth his neighbour drink, that putteth thy bottle to him, and makest him drunken also, that thou mightest look on their nakedness.” (Hab. ii. 15.)

In addition to all these facts and considerations, I beg the Christian to ponder well the law of Christ, as inculcated in numerous texts and passages similar to the following.

“Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.” (Matt. xix. 19.)

“Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.” (Matt. vii. 12.)

“To him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin.” (James, iv. 17.)

“If thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out.” “If thy right hand offend thee, cut it off.” (Matt. v. 29, 30.)

“For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?” (Mark, viii. 36, 37.)

“Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God.” (1 Cor. x. 31.)

Can any man, who believes the gospel, or who feels disposed to conform to its precepts, justify himself before the tribunal of his own conscience for continuing another

day in a business so destructive to his fellow-men, and so likely to bring down the vengeance of Heaven upon himself and his family? Can he pray to God for a blessing upon his traffic in ardent spirits—*now*, since its proper character has been fully developed and exposed?

But the law of Christianity is binding on all men to whom it has been promulgated, whether they profess to recognize it or not.

It is honourable to several Christian sects, and to many individuals of all sects, that they have subscribed to the law of temperance without reserve, and to the utmost extent contended for by temperance associations.

And here I cannot forbear to add, that the Quakers or "*Friends*, in excluding ardent spirits from the list of lawful articles of commerce, have done themselves immortal honour; and in the temperance of their families, and their thrift in business, have set an example which is worthy the admiration and imitation of all the churches in our land" and in the world.

The temperance reformation, which originated in this country, and which has advanced and extended with unparalleled rapidity into every State and section of the Union; has also reached the adjacent islands and colonies, has been welcomed upon the shores of Great Britain, has penetrated into the interior of the European continent, has found friends and advocates among the native islanders of the Southern Ocean, and bids fair speedily to pervade every land and to influence every people where the light of the gospel shines. And shall we

refuse to embark in this glorious cause, or deny ourselves the benefits which it so cheaply proffers?

“A very happy illustration was given of the catholic character of temperance societies at the formation of the Ulster Temperance Society, (in Ireland, 1829,) when six clergymen, of six different religious persuasions, enrolled their names as members at the head of the list; and on the committee at present there are individuals of twelve different religious denominations.”

Let us imitate this catholic example of Christian Ireland. Let the several Christian sects of Nashville, while they agree to differ, and to differ honestly in matters of doctrine, discipline and ceremonial, cordially unite against the common enemy of all religion and of all human happiness.

Let us imitate the primitive Christians, who, in the purest ages of the church, when their faith was literally tried by the fire of persecution, did not hesitate to form associations to discountenance every species of immorality, and to fortify and sustain each other in the practice of virtue and of duty; or, as Pliny writes, respecting them, to his imperial master, about fifty years after St. Paul's time, they were accustomed “*to bind themselves by an oath, not to the commission of any wickedness, but that they would never falsify their word, nor deny a pledge committed to them when called upon to return it.*”*

With such an illustrious precedent for our guide, we need not dread the charge of innovation, or of attempt-

* Paley's Evid., p. 61.

ing a work of supererogation, when we voluntarily associate for the purpose of emancipating ourselves, our country, and our posterity from the odious thralldom of intemperance.

How beautiful and cheering to the eye and the heart of humanity and patriotism and Christian charity would not be the moral aspect of this favoured and growing city, if ardent spirit were forever excluded from our commerce and from our habitations?

How many happy mothers, wives, sisters, daughters, would not be assured by this one act, which we are now summoned to perform, of heroic self-denial, and of generous devotion to the purest affections and permanent felicity of those whom it is our pride and our honour to love and to protect?

Ladies too have often been directly appealed to on occasions like the present—and I believe their suffrage in behalf of the temperance cause has never been withheld. Would they exert all the influence which they justly possess in every Christian community, they would soon constrain the lords of creation to walk in the paths of virtue and sobriety. I hope they will not be held responsible in the last great day for all the evil which they might have prevented.

The members of the Tennessee Temperance Society have agreed and promised to abstain totally from the use of ardent spirits—and they cordially invite others to join them upon the same condition. This, I understand, is the precise object of our present meeting.

Let us, then, my friends, before God and this assem-

bly, declare that, henceforward, we will touch not, taste not, handle not, the accursed thing. Let us, without fear or shame or hesitation, add our names to the hundreds of thousands of the good and wise, who, in every region of Christendom, are labouring to exterminate this pestiferous and most degrading iniquity from the face of the earth.

This, at least, will be one of the few transactions of our lives which we shall never regret, and which will not aggravate the gloom and the terrors of a dying bed.

MISCELLANEOUS ESSAYS.

BANKS—BROKERS—USURY.

A SERIES OF FRAGMENTARY THOUGHTS.*

“WHEREFORE then gavest not thou my money into the bank, that at my coming I might have required mine own with usury?” *επι την τραπεζαν*, (Luke, xix. 23.) *τραπεζα*, a table, with four legs—the table of a money-changer—a broker’s table or counter—a broker’s office or bank, where money was deposited and loaned out on interest or usury.

1. Usury or interest. The law of Moses. Opinion of Aristotle. Mohammed’s prohibition. The canon law. Usury pronounced a mortal sin by the canon law of the church.

2. Banks. Their origin and primitive character. The Jews were bankers, brokers, and money-lenders, for many ages, among the principal cities, after their dispersion from Judea.

* This and the following article, published here just as they stand in the author’s manuscript, are given as illustrations of his method of preparing materials for his extemporaneous and conversational lectures. The reader will in fact find many of these little fragmentary thoughts wrought out and incorporated in other parts of his writings. These two pieces are inserted as specimens of a large class of similar collections of facts and ideas, arranged evidently with a view to be reproduced in a lecture or course of lectures, in the class room or before a public audience.

3. Modern Banks.

4. Bank of Venice, established in 1157 or 1171. Continued to prosper until destroyed by the French in 1798. It was a bank of deposit only—not of issue or discount.

5. Barcelona, 1401. Called “Table of Exchange.”

6. Genoa, 1407.

7. Amsterdam, 1609.

8. Hamburgh, 1619. Plundered by *Davoust*, 1813.

9. General character and uses of Banks of Deposit.

10. Bank of England, 1693 or 1694. Suspended cash payments from 1797 to 1823, or 26 years. This was the first bank of issue, discount, circulation, etc., upon the modern plan.

11. Scotland, 1695. “Bank of Scotland.” Another called the “Royal Bank of Scotland,” 1727. Still another, called “The British Linen Company,” 1746. All other banks in Scotland are private copartnerships, existing under a general law, and managed with great ability.

12. Bank of Vienna, created in 1703, as a bank of deposit and circulation. Became a bank of issue in 1791.

13. Law’s famous Bank, 1716. Its true character at the outset. Became the “Royal Bank,” 1718. The precise nature of the fatal change—both of name and character.

14. North America, 1781. Commenced operations in January, 1782. This was the first bank in America. Chartered at first by Congress; afterwards by Pennsylvania.—Expired in 1813. Rechartered.

15. First United States Bank, 1791. Expired, March 3, 1811.

16. Second United States Bank, 1816. Expired March 3, 1836. Rechartered, as a State bank, by Pennsylvania. Stock or shares owned by women and orphans and benevolent institutions to the amount of \$5,223,800, at the time of its utter failure.

17. Bank of France, 1803.

18. Money. Precious metals. Gold and silver, coin and bullion—neither signs or representatives nor measures of value. Mere commodities, etc.

19. Exchanges. How affected by a mere metallic currency. How by bills, etc. How by banks and bankers. The broker's appropriate vocation.—Useful and necessary

20. Benefits resulting from banks. Evils, do.

21. Public and private banks. In Europe and America. The history, and existing facts.

22. Incorporations. What is a corporation? A body or a number of persons associated, according to law, to do precisely what any individual might do without legal or special grant from the government.

23. Are banks *monopolies*? Who created them? Who is responsible for their action? Who is blameworthy, if they do wrong? The legislature—the government—the sovereign people—to be sure.

24. Are banks—incorporated banks—to be regarded as *contracts*? If so, ought they not to be fulfilled, according to the letter and spirit of the bond, even if they prove bad bargains to the *people* who made them?

25. How is a bank got up and established in our country? Some curious facts—illustrative, etc.

26. Who are the stockholders—the permanent *bona fide* stock or shareholders—after speculators have sold out? Ought their rights to be protected? What voice have *they* usually in the management? or what do they know about the concern?

27. The directors. In order to the safety of a properly organized bank, the directors ought to manage its affairs as the mere agents of the stockholders; and to be held responsible for every violation of the charter or perversion of its funds. They ought never to become borrowers—directly or indirectly. Their business is to *lend*—not to *borrow*. Pay them for their services—reduce their number—anything, rather than allow them *stealings*, under any name, form, guise or usage.

28. Secrets. No oaths of secrecy. There ought to be no concealment—no mystery—no favouritism.

29. Government preferences—inexpedient and unjust—as in cases of insolvent or bankrupt debtors. Why should the claims of government be satisfied in preference to those of the widow and the orphan?

30. It is just as right and proper for a man to *lend* money as to borrow; and it ought to be just as honourable. There can be no borrowers without lenders.

31. Advantages to the labouring classes, afforded by banks—both as borrowers and lenders. How shall they best dispose of their small earnings? Whence procure adequate aid when most needed? Savings banks—Scotch savings banks.

32. The free-banking system—so-called—now very popular and prevalent in many States. Based on National or State *debts*—as if the bonds or evidences of such debts could be sold for cash, at any moment, in the market, at rates to satisfy all demands, etc. Such banks must fail, sooner or later.

33. The only legitimate *material* for a bank is gold and silver—*i.e.* cash, or current money, or bullion—so that every *promissory note*, payable at sight to bearer, should truly *represent* the sum specified on its face. Thus, a bank, with a million dollars in its vaults, might issue paper to that amount, and no more. Of course, such a bank would not increase the real or nominal capital of the country—and might therefore be denounced as worthless. Not so, however. A *paper* substitute for *specie* would afford many advantages, even though it did not augment the actual or nominal amount of capital or current money by a single dollar.

1. It would be safer. It could be more easily and cheaply transferred from place to place—as by mails, etc.—almost without cost. The transportation of gold and silver is not only expensive, but always hazardous, whether by land or water.
2. The loss of paper, by fire or other accident, would be no loss to the public—but only to the individual holder or owner of such paper. Bills of exchange and bank bills are not property—but only evidences of property—like the title-deeds of landed estates, which may be lost or destroyed—while the lands remain intact, etc.
3. When gold and silver are lost in the ocean or lake or river or by fire, it is a dead loss, not

only to the actual owner, but to the public, to the community, to the world. It is the absolute destruction or annihilation of positive value—of actual wealth—and the nation is so much the poorer by every such disaster. If twenty millions of American gold were lost, on their way to Liverpool, we, as a nation, would be the poorer by that amount. If insured in Europe, the loss would fall upon Europe. In either case, the whole world will have lost twenty millions. Individuals are the immediate and ostensible sufferers, it is true; but as national or universal wealth is but the aggregate of individual wealth, so whatever diminishes the one must equally affect the other. Were twenty millions of *paper* orders or promises thus lost, the *value* thus represented or pledged would remain *in statu quo*—just as before. 4. Metallic money or coin is not only liable to loss in a thousand ways, but is subjected to constant wear and tear in passing from hand to hand. Thus, by friction alone, the coined pieces are gradually worn out, or greatly diminished in value. If paper were substituted for a currency, in any State, exactly equal to the *cash* or *bullion* locked up in the State's strong box for its redemption on demand, what benefits might not be conferred on all the parties concerned? 5. Besides the above and many other considerations—why should there ever be factitious money or fictitious capital? Why should anything pass as money, which is not money, and which does not *represent* money? [I do not object to bank bills which actually represent, or pass in lieu of, the specie always on hand.] Most of the commercial difficulties, embarrassments, convulsions and revolutions,

which have occurred, within the modern banking age, are probably owing to bank agency and influence in some form or other. Banks expand and contract their issues and accommodations, oftentimes arbitrarily, capriciously, unwisely, injudiciously, ignorantly, rashly, wickedly. Every genuine commodity in the market is injured by the appearance of any counterfeit article—so long as the latter can be made to pass as the former. The counterfeit might drive the genuine entirely out of the market. Thus paper dollars, though not counterfeit in a legal sense, serve the purpose just as well. They are, in general, mere additions to the existing specie circulation—and passing everywhere as of equal value—dollar for dollar; thereby gradually diminishing the value of the real dollar by every additional substitute—until the country becomes flooded with an ocean of mere nominal *promises to pay*, etc.

34. Consider the differences between the old and now obsolete banks of deposit, and the one hinted at in the last article, and the modern banks generally.

35. Most banks in our country have been, and probably still are, grossly mismanaged. What shall be done with them, when they suspend cash or specie payments? This is oftentimes a difficult and complex question or problem. Various considerations are involved—as,

The interests of stockholders—widows, orphans, etc.

The interests of the note or bill holders.

The interests of the public—in regard to all branches of industry, etc.

36. Who ought to fix the salaries of the President, Cashier, and other bank officers?

37. Why is bank-paper worth anything after the suspension of specie payments? It may be, more or less, valuable on several accounts—as, *debtors* to the bank will be eager to get its *notes* for payment, and thereby give them a marketable value; its other available means and assets, etc.

38. Remedies for vicious banking—under the modern or prevailing system. 1. Good charters. 2. Competent and faithful directors. 3. Moderate loans, and always to trustworthy parties. 4. The directory to be made responsible for the judicious management of the bank. 5. No director or other officer ever to be allowed to *borrow* for himself or friends. 6. No voting by proxy. 7. No oaths of secrecy; no mysteries—or *bank secrets*. 8. No interference or meddling by legislature, or any government authorities—except, according to law and the charter, etc. 9. The rights and interests of the stockholders to be sacredly guarded, protected, and advanced—as promised in the charter, etc.

39. Banks of New England. Banks of Scotland. Best in the world. Their peculiar features. How conducted. Their uniform success and usefulness.

40. Banks, on the whole, a great invention. Have contributed much to modern civilization—to liberty, agriculture, commerce, manufactures, intelligence, morality, religion—[witness poor old Scotland again.]

MAXIMS — SOPHISMS — DOGMAS — FALLACIES —
THEMES — NOTHINGS — SUGGESTIONS ;

OR, MATERIALS FOR REFLECTION.

1. “How can you and Dr. Erskine be such friends?” was a question put to an ultra convivial Scottish judge— “no two men could be more unlike each other.” “Because he’s an honest saint, and I’m an honest sinner,” was the reply.

2. A certain French lady, in a dispute with her sister, said: “I don’t know how it happens, sister, but I meet with nobody but myself, that is always in the right”— “il n’y a que moi qui a toujours raison.” [Others give it thus: “Je ne trouve que moi qui a toujours raison;” or, “Je ne vois que moi qui a toujours raison.”]

3. “To the victors belong the spoils.” (*Marcy.*)

4. “Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel.” (*Dr. Johnson.*)

5. “The Church of Rome is infallible, and the Church of England is never in the wrong.” (*Steele.*)

6. The Romish Church says: “You must *not* think for yourself, but take our creed.” The Protestant Churches say: You *must* think for yourself, but take our creed.”

7. “I wish popularity, but it is that popularity which *follows*, not that which is run after; it is *that* popularity

which, sooner or later, never fails to do justice to the pursuit of noble ends by noble means." (*Mansfield.*)

8. "How rare are those happy times when men may think what they please and say what they think." (*Tacitus.*)

9. It was said of Andrew Fletcher, "He would have died to serve his country; but he would not do a base thing to *save* it."

10. "Rank is but the guinea stamp,
The man's the gowd for a' that." * * *
"The honest man, though e'er sae poor,
Is king o' men for a' that." (*Burns.*)

11. "The people are prone to expect too much of the government.—The government has enough to do to take care of itself." (*Van Buren.*)

12. "Pulchrum est benefacere reipublicæ: etiam benedicere haud absurdum est." (*Sallust*, p. 3.)

13. "Homo sum, humani nil a me alienum puto." (*Terence.*)

14. "Seest thou a man diligent in his business? he shall stand before kings; he shall not stand before mean men." (*Prov.* xxii. 29.)

15. "Virtue alone is true nobility." (*Dryden.*)

16. * * "stat magni nominis umbra." (*Lucan*, lib. i. 135.)

17. Ingenium superat vives.

18. "Had I but served my God with half the zeal
I served my king, he would not in mine age
Have left me naked to mine enemies."

(*Wolsey*, in *Henry VIII.*)

19. * * * * "From his cradle,
He was a scholar, and a ripe and good one."

(Said of *Wolsey*, in Henry VIII.)

20. "The possible destiny of the United States of America, as a nation of a hundred millions of freemen, stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, living under the laws of Alfred, and speaking the language of Shakspeare and Milton, is an august conception." (*Coleridge*.)

21. "Tu tua fac cures: cætera mitte Deo." That is,
"Take care to do your duty: leave the rest to God."

22. "Solitudinem faciunt, pacem adpellant." (*Tacitus*.)

23. "Opinionum commenta delet dies; naturæ judicia confirmat."

24. "Veritas nihil veretur nisi abscondi." Truth fears nothing but concealment.

25. "Beware of the man of one book."

26. "If ever the liberties of this Republic are destroyed, it will be by Romish priests." (*Lafayette*.)

27. "Ubi tres ibi Ecclesia."

28. "Wherever God erects a house of prayer,
The Devil always builds a chapel there."

(*De Foe*.)

29. "O fortunati, nimium, sua si bona norint." (*Virgil*.)

30. "Here lies he who never feared the face of man."
(Said the Regent *Morton* at the grave of *Knox*.)

31. "For what purpose did he consider rivers to have been created?" [question put by the Duke of Bridgewater to the celebrated engineer, James Brindley, who replied,]
"Undoubtedly to feed navigable canals."

32. "Ne sutor ultra crepidam." "Qui docet, discit."

33. "Studium sine calamo et somnium."

34. * * * "nil sine magno

Vita labore dedit mortalibus."

(*Hor. Sat.*, lib. i.; *Sat.* 9, 59.)

35. * * * "Video meliora proboque,

Deteriora sequor." (*Ovid*, *Met.* 7, 20.)

36. "Maxima debetur pueris reverentia." (*Juvenal.*)

37. "He who is ignorant of foreign languages, is ignorant of his own." (*Goethe.*)

38. Though the ass may make a pilgrimage to Mecca, yet an ass he will come back. (*Arabic Proverb.*)

39. King James I., in his "A COUNTERBLAST TO TOBACCO," compares the smoke of tobacco to the smoke of the bottomless pit; and says it is only proper to regale the devil after dinner.

40. "Go and see with your own eyes," "Quam parva sapientia regitur mundus?" said *Oxenstiern* to his son, etc.

41. "The very worst use to which you can put a man is to hang him." (*John Wilkes.*)

42. There is nothing that succeeds with the world like a success. (*French proverb.*)

43. "As I take my shoes from the shoemaker, and my coat from the tailor, so I take my religion from the priest." (*Goldsmith.*)

44. "Fas est et ab hoste doceri."

45. "I have met with mechanics in the first societies in Europe, from which idlers of high rank are excluded; and was once introduced by a coppersmith to the intimacy of a duke." (*Gouverneur Morris*, by *Sparks.*)

46. Burns, Bloomfield, Clare, Hogg, and Allan Cun-

ningham.—“These all fall spontaneously into one bright cluster, which we may call the Constellation of the Plough.” (*Gilfillan*, p. 390.)

47. All is fair in politics. Which means that men may lie, cheat, etc., to compass any political end.

48. “There is a courageous wisdom: there is also a false reptile prudence, the result not of caution but of fear.” (*Burke*, vol. 4, p. 337.)

49. The end sanctifies or justifies the means. Not peculiar to the Jesuits. All sects, cliques, and parties practice in accordance with it.

50. Faith is not to be kept with heretics, nor with any who differ from us in the slightest degree.

51. Slavery is unjust—therefore to be immediately abolished—without regard to consequences. This is the ultraism of the abolitionists.

52. Slavery authorized by Scripture and by the practice of all ages; and therefore a righteous institution, and ought to be maintained and perpetuated in our country, as both a constitutional right and a national blessing.—This is the ultraism of the pro-slavery party.

53. The majority govern. “*Vox populi, vox Dei.*” In what sense true, in what false.

54. Preachers and college professors apt to be dogmatical, as well as *some* lawyers, politicians, and lecturers upon all sorts of themes and things.

55. Trial by jury. Bad in theory, good in practice. Works better than it promises.

56. Legislative assemblies ought never to be made *electing*, and therefore *electioneering* bodies. Judges,

sheriffs, attorneys, county clerks, etc., had better be chosen by the people than by any State Legislature. The British Parliament, American Congress, French House of Deputies, do not elect—except their own servants and officers. The American Senate merely *confirms* certain executive nominations. Every State Legislature elects United States Senators. Some of them choose the governors. All exercise the elective function to a greater or less extent. Instead of being a purely *law-making*, grave, deliberative council of sages, each legislature becomes a venal, corrupt, intriguing, *log-rolling*, political *caucus*, etc.

57. Results, ends or objects, often agreed upon, or recognized as desirable, by all men—while they differ and dispute about the ways and means of attaining them. Thus, (1.) all our people advocate the cause of universal education, of common schools, etc.—but disagree as to the system or plan, mode of support, religious instruction, sectarian control, Catholic, Protestant, infidel, etc. (2.) Same of internal improvements—roads, canals, etc.—whether by State or National government—or by private companies, etc. (3.) Do. about banks, currency, money, usury, etc. (4.) About home industry—domestic manufactures—tariff—taxes, etc.

58. History of the New England system of education—of schools and colleges. Curious and worthy of special study. At the outset, the support of both schools and religion was voluntary. The first colonies of New England had no government but what was voluntary. Religion and education formed an essential part of their

political system. Is their system adapted to States which have grown up without the *habit* of self-taxation for such purposes? Connecticut School Fund. Whence obtained—how managed. Whether beneficial or not—actual condition of schools, before and since, etc.

59. A national debt, a national blessing, [benefit.]
A national debt, a national curse, [burden or evil.]
When the one, and when the other?

60. *Ad valorem* duties or taxes, etc.

61. Free trade. A capital theory. Never attempted in practice. What is free trade? Freedom from all taxation, or hindrance or burden of any sort. Very desirable, no doubt. But can a government be sustained without a revenue from taxes of some kind? If not, why exempt the commodities of international commerce from their share of the burden rather than the other descriptions of property?

62. Tariff. The nearest approximation to free trade practicable, would be identity of charges, duties or imposts among the nations trading with each other. Thus, between this country and Great Britain, the duties on all manufactured articles—as of iron, cotton, wool, flax, hemp, wood, glass, leather, paper, tobacco, silk, books, etc.,—ought to be precisely the same, when imported into either from the other. Is such the fact? England may admit the *raw* material without duty; but does she admit the manufacture? She may welcome our *cotton-bales*; but will she take our muslins and calicoes? If not, then there is no reciprocity or fairness in the arrangement. Then about our tobacco.—What are the facts, and the questions fairly at issue?

63. Banks so associated with all moneyed transactions, that people fancy they (the banks) *create* money, furnish exchanges, make good prices, etc., at pleasure.

64. Privileges taxable in Tennessee and some other States. What are privileges?

65. Brokers. Why tax *them* as if they were a nuisance?

66. Whisky dealers. Horse-racing. Lotteries. Gambling. Legislation thereupon.

67. *Summum jus est summa injuria.*

68. Usury or interest of money loaned. How far and in what circumstances to be regulated by law.

69. Judicial oaths.

70. Militia system.

71. Penitentiaries—lunatic asylums.

72. Children of persons imprisoned for crimes are educated in Prussia by the Government. (See *Stowe.*)

73. Charitable institutions. For the blind—the deaf and dumb—for orphans—abandoned females—houses of industry, refuge, etc.

74. Motives for self-education; how to be accomplished.

75. All healthy, industrious, sober, frugal, honest parents in our country, could or can educate their own children. And they would do so, were public opinion or the State to furnish an adequate motive. For example—suffer no man to vote, to practise a trade, or to marry, who cannot read and write. How soon would every man (of twenty-one) be duly qualified? etc.

76. Religious toleration—what? Equal rights to all

religionists—what? Differences in this respect between us, and all other countries. *Dissenters*. Can there be any among us?

77. The clergy, why excluded from civil office? history of this exclusion, and the reasons of it in the States where it prevails. Wherever the Church of England was established before the Revolution, *there* immediately after, the clergy were made ineligible to office—as in New York, Virginia, etc. The new States followed the example of their several mothers—as Kentucky of Virginia, Tennessee of North Carolina, Alabama of Georgia, etc. While New England, New Jersey and Pennsylvania escaped *English churchism*, their daughters have been like them—so that ministers of the gospel are deemed as trustworthy and as eligible to office as are tailors or rum venders.

78. How ought the different religious sects to regard and to treat each other? How can perfect liberty of conscience be assured to all the people? How can priest-craft or priest power be regulated, checked or controlled, so as not to be arbitrary, oppressive, cruel or inquisitorial? Ought Jews, Romanists, Moslems, or Mormons, or Pagans of any name—to be allowed in this country to prohibit the reading of the Bible by their grown-up children, etc.?

79. Genius or peculiar character of the American Constitution and Government. Without a model, example or parallel, in ancient or modern times. Origin, growth, progress,—modifying circumstances in different localities. People always free, and self-

governing. *Habits* not changed by the revolution of 1776.

80. Federal Constitution designed to protect from wrong and injustice every class of citizens and every individual of each—the poor, the widow, the orphan,—and to promote the welfare of all and each.

81. Our governments, National and State, calculated for any extent or extension of territory—for the *voluntary* accession or annexation of Mexico, Cuba, Canada, or *China*.—Why not?

82. Southern chivalry. Blustering about a dissolution of the Union. How unlike the magnanimous patriots of the glorious Revolution! Why should the South *threaten* the North? Which could do the other most damage?

83. The constitutional remedy for all grievances.

84. State rights. Has any one of our States ever been an independent nation? (Always excepting Texas.)

85. The precise cause or causes of the American Revolution—Taxation and Representation, etc.

86. Our Revolution was strictly *conservative*. Its object was to maintain inviolate our inherited constitutional rights and franchises as Englishmen. [All the English revolutions or rebellions were likewise conservative—as of Charles I. and Cromwell, the Restoration of Charles II., of William and Mary, etc.]

87. History of the Anglo-Saxon race, in England and in America. The Normans, and all others, gradually absorbed by the Saxons. The same process in operation here. Foreign immigrants, from whatever nation, in due

time, imbibe the spirit of the dominant race, and become good Anglo-American citizens.

88. Gratitude is—"A lively sense of favours to be received."

89. "Save me from my friends, and I will take care of my enemies."

90. *Murder*. "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." (1 *John*, iii. 15.)

91. American Colonization Society. Liberia. The transportation of free negroes to Africa will effect three good objects. 1. Our own country will be rid of said negroes. 2. They will themselves be placed in a far better position. 3. Africa may be civilized and Christianized by their agency.

92. Liberia.—The only republic in the world like our own.

93. Cromwell—Washington—Moses. Authors of great revolutions.

94. Fortunate for Africa, that her besotted children were brought hither to be trained and qualified for freedom, self-government, etc.

95. *Free and slave labour compared*. (*Smith and Say*.)

96. Is a school fund, to be raised by taxation, desirable? were it even practicable. Would not an annual tax for annual use be preferable? The accumulation of large funds for future generations, of very dubious policy. Connecticut acquired her vast school fund by sale of the Western Reserve. Its benefits extremely doubtful.

7. French Republicanism. Treatment of the Arab

chief, *Abd-el-Kader*. Why not sympathize with the latter as well as with Kossuth of Hungary? Why not denounce France as well as Austria?

98. American Aristocracy. What? where? At the *North*, or at the *South*?

99. *Negroes*. While they remain in our country, and live among us, must occupy one of three positions. They must be—1. Our superiors; or, 2. Our equals; or, 3. Our inferiors—socially and politically.

100. What constitutes a great *man*? There have been great poets, great orators, great warriors, great statesmen, great artists, etc. But where are the *great men*? Washington was a specimen of true greatness as a *man*.

101. New Constitutions of Tennessee and Indiana—compared with the old.

102. Oliver Cromwell—the *Puritan*: and George Fox—the *Quaker*. Two extremes, of the same age. The first, trained in the school of Joshua, had faith in the sword and in a good cause. The latter, following Christ, rejected all carnal weapons. Both erred in a too literal interpretation and application of their respective guides. Cromwell, of the *Old Testament*, and Fox, of the *New*.

103. The conflicts during the Stuart dynasty involved principles of infinite value both in religion and politics. The points raised by the nation in that grand debate were—whether as Christians they should be free to follow the dictates of conscience, or be bound to worship God in a form prescribed by human authority—whether as citizens they should be governed by law, or by the arbitrary will of the prince.

104. It is an instructive fact, that every sect under persecution has got a glimpse of the rights of conscience, and that every sect in power has, to a greater or less extent, violated them.

105. Men value what they pay for—and *vice versa*. Hence, free schools and gratuitous education, seldom successful or greatly beneficial. A *violent* motive to self-reliance and self-exertion, better than any legal or public assistance. It is curious to observe how eager are the slaves to learn to read and write *now* since laws have been passed, prohibiting their instruction. They love the forbidden fruit. What the law denies and condemns, they covet and struggle to acquire.

106. In order to encourage, protect and sustain the manufacture of cotton, for example, at home: suppose a law should be enacted by Congress prohibiting the importation of all cotton fabrics after a certain fixed period, say five or ten years. What would be the effect? Capitalists, both at home and abroad, would immediately begin to prepare for the event. The country would be filled with factories, and with foreign capital, operatives, etc.

107. Suppose Tennessee had the constitutional right to levy a tax of \$20 upon every carriage imported from other States: would our present carriage-makers be the only party benefited? or would carriages become dearer in the long run? The demand would soon insure a full supply. Whole establishments from the East would soon be located here—besides the additional stimulus to native industry and enterprise.

108. How would agriculture be affected by the creation of a hundred flourishing cities, towns and villages in our midst, mainly engaged in the manufacture of our own abundant and now almost useless raw materials, and consuming the products of our farms, etc.? all the time?

109. No uniform tariff of duties upon foreign manufactures, could be made to operate in favour of one class more than another. It could not create a monopoly. It would operate equally throughout the Union—in Georgia as in Massachusetts.

110. The best system of taxation, is that which taxes consumption. Such is our present *national* system. Such is not our *State* system. The latter is very objectionable. Better tax what a man spends or consumes, [beyond a liberal allowance for the necessaries and comforts of life,] than to tax what he gains or earns by honest industry and economy. Tax whisky and Bowie knives, rather than salt or sugar.

111. The prevailing demagogue bluster about the *poor*—also, about mechanics, etc.

112. Cheap labour in Europe, assigned as a reason why manufactures cannot be sustained in this country, etc. The reason is just as applicable to agriculture. We ought to quit farming, and import our bread from Europe—where cheap labour can drive all American competition from the market.

113. Legislative attempts to elevate the social and political position of mechanics or farmers—nugatory, and injurious. Superior education alone can raise them

to a par with other well-educated classes. Franklin did not exalt the *trade* or vocation of printing; nor Sherman that of shoemaking, by their individual enterprise. They merely elevated themselves—far above their primitive associates—who remained as before, etc.

114. One-fourth of our present labouring people could produce food enough for our entire population. What shall the rest do?

115. Constitution making and mending—all the rage, among our *wise* politicians.

116. Thorough literal democracy—frequent elections—universal suffrage—all public officers to be chosen by the people, and by ballot—inevitable. Let us try it.

117. Our legal and judicial system should be reformed and simplified. Technical barbarisms and verbose formulas should be abolished, and common sense allowed to prevail, etc.

118. Balance of trade. What?

119. Laws prohibiting the exportation of *specie* always inexpedient—and never effective.

120. Gold and silver, in any and all forms, constitute but a very small part of the wealth of a nation, or State, or individual.

121. Popular education cannot be sustained in Tennessee and other slaveholding States, as in New England, because the population is too scattered, living, not in villages, but on plantations remote from each other, etc.

122. We, Americans, have no rulers or governors or

masters or superiors. The President of the United States has no more authority or power over me, than I over him. The *law* governs—and not *man*.

123. Russia invites ingenious mechanics and manufacturers from all countries to settle and labour among her people, etc. Sound policy.

124. The last national bankrupt law was made necessary by previous absurd and vicious banking—which stimulated *speculation* and *borrowing* to the wildest extreme, etc.

125. Extremes meet. Thus: abolitionists at the North, and *ultra pro-slavery* men at the South, both *apparently* eager to dissolve the Union—both agree in supporting the same presidential candidate—and in sharing all public offices, etc.

126. English East India Company. Chartered in 1600. Contemplate the progress and prospects of Anglo-Saxondom!! in Asia, Africa, America, Australia!

127. It is asserted to be unconstitutional for Congress to prohibit slavery in any territories, annexed to the Union by conquest or purchase. How so? The constitution is silent on the whole subject; makes no provision for such acquisitions; seems never to have contemplated anything of the kind, etc. The *letter* of the constitution, therefore, ceases to be our rule or guide. We must meet the emergency agreeably to its *spirit*; and in a way to consult and promote the best interests of the great republic. The general good—the peace, harmony and happiness of the whole people—must be studied, etc.

128. The District of Columbia. Congress is its only legislature. Suppose the inhabitants of said District desire and petition for the abolition of slavery: how would or ought Congress to act?

129. The South prefers a claim to its share of the territory acquired from Mexico: namely, that it shall be a slaveholding region. It claims to have contributed even more than the North towards its conquest. If so, it was a matter of choice—for immense bodies of *volunteers* in the free States were rejected by government; and the preference given to those of the South, because they were nearer to the scene of war, etc.

130. The said territory belongs neither to the North nor to the South. It will be sold to individuals, from any and every quarter, who may choose to occupy it. The proceeds go into the national treasury, for the common benefit of the whole. Southerners may purchase as much as they please—enough to make a new slave State, if so disposed.

131. Dissolve the Union, upon the slavery question. What possible benefit could accrue to the South? What would *then* be the position of the negroes?

132. “My thoughts, I must confess, are turned on peace.”

133. Southern champions maintain that the extension of slavery into new States and territories, will not increase their number. A grand mistake!

134. The constitution may be violated, perverted, nullified—covertly, indirectly, virtually, speciously, insidiously—as by converting every State legislature into a

body of censors and instructors over the United States Senators. The latter are now much less independent than the lower house, and more liable to be turned out. In fact, they are at the mercy of every annual legislature.

Thus, too, the President may contrive to get up a fight between some portion of our army or navy and that of a foreign power; and then Congress must declare that war actually exists between the two nations, etc.

135. Twaddlers. Not a few—here and there—in the pulpit and in the lecture-room.

136. Nearly all the measures opposed by the South at present, originated at the South, or were suggested and advocated by Southern members of Congress.—As, 1. Internal improvements under Jefferson—afterwards by Calhoun. 2. The late National Bank, by Lowndes and Calhoun under Madison. 3. *Tariff* for protection of home industry, by Calhoun, soon after last British war. 4. The last two wars—mainly by Southern politicians. 5. Even *abolitionism* was first projected and organized by emigrants from the South—as by the two Misses Grimkè from Charleston, South Carolina; James Birney of Huntsville, Alabama. Beman, Palfrey, Garrison, etc. resided long at the South, etc.

137. Penitentiary. The worst kind of corporal punishment. *Reforms* nobody.

138. The American Union. Not to be severed by the insane politicians and reckless aspirants at Washington.

139. Congress has not the constitutional right or power to authorize or to prohibit the introduction of slavery

into any of the territories,—any more than into the States.

140. Wilmot Proviso and Missouri Compromise—both unconstitutional. The constitution knows nothing of slavery. The *nation* knows it not. It is a merely local, municipal, or State affair. The *people* of each territory or State must determine for themselves.

141. “It is the glory of God to conceal a thing; but the honour of kings is to search out a matter.” (*Prov.* xxv. 2.)

142. The SOUTH should assert her rights and redress her wrongs in a constitutional way, in the Union: not seek to get out of it, and thereby forfeit all claim either to sympathy or justice.

143. *Iago*. How many *Iagos* infest society!

144. Contrasts. Washington and Mirabeau. Milton and Byron. Fenelon and Bossuet. Laud and Leighton. Cowper and Moore.

145. Party is: “The madness of many for the gain of a few.”

146. “Liberté! que de crimes commis en ton nom!” exclaimed Madame Roland, as she mounted the scaffold, etc.

147. “Civis Romanus sum.” “I am an American citizen,” ought to be the highest distinction and safest passport among men.

148. Newspapers. All controlled by, and devoted to, sect or party.

Political and religious papers are confessedly in this predicament. They are *liberal* and *independent*, just so

far as their own interest requires, and no further. Thus, the most violent whig or democratic journal, in order to win the patronage of all religionists, will very graciously be neutral on the subject, and say nothing offensive to any sect. The religious journal, in like manner, eschews party politics—is neither whig nor democratic—so that both parties may safely patronize the orthodox Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Methodist, Baptist, or Catholic.—But not one of them will ever dare to publish a *truth* or *fact* calculated to give offence to their own sect or party.

Literary and scientific journals and periodicals generally proclaim their independence and catholicity, by the announcement (in their prospectus) that they will not meddle with religion or politics. Their policy is to get subscribers and purchasers from every religious denomination and from all political cliques and parties. Could a strictly honest, impartial, enlightened, manly, brave, conscientious, independent, gifted, noble, generous, wise, unselfish, *holy, angelic* author, editor or conductor of any periodical whatever, be sustained and duly paid? for a year or a month? would he escape martyrdom, under Judge Lynch's summary process and convenient code?

149. *Slavery* would come to a speedy end, or die out, under the quiet operation of the following five laws, without any *direct* legislation against this favourite domestic institution of the South. 1. The Cuban law, giving opportunity to the slaves to earn their freedom and that of their children. 2. The law of the dark ages in respect to the feudal serf, giving to the child the condition of its

father, and not as now, wickedly and cruelly, that of its mother. 3. A law forbidding the internal slave-trade. 4. A law repealing all statutes against the emancipation and education of slaves, and encouraging both. 5. A law by each of the States and by the General Government, appropriating money to aid all willing emigrants to reach Liberia. [From New York *Independent* of July 28, 1853.] I approve the last (No. 5) suggestion especially—and would add to it, the justice and expediency of remunerating slave-owners from the national treasury—at least, to some extent.

NEGRO SLAVERY IN AMERICA.*

THE following texts of Scripture may serve to prove and illustrate, 1. The unity of the human family; or that all men are descended from Adam and Eve. 2. The diversity of character and condition actually existing among men in different ages and countries—including civilized and savage, black and white, bond and free, etc. 3. That all, or that some of all nations, however ignorant and degraded, are to be converted to the Christian faith.—The negro among the rest.

Genesis, i. 27. "So God created man in his own image,

* The present article, like the two preceding ones, is a mere fragment or collection of separate heads and themes of thought, to be used for subsequent discussion. It is evidently too brief and imperfect to be taken as a fair exponent of the author's opinions on the subject of which it treats. Some of the expressions here used, as the arguments or mottoes of different parties, he would probably have combated as being in conflict with his own convictions; for, as abundantly shown in all his writings, he was a warm friend of the African race, and a decided emancipationist, provided only that some safe and feasible method could be found. The article should be read in connection with the one on page 663 of the present volume, where the author has expressed himself in very strong and unequivocal terms on the whole subject. Lest any one should think there is an incongruity between the views here and there presented, it is due to Dr. Lindsley to state that this fragment was written at New Albany after a residence of twenty-six years in Tennessee; while the extract on page 663 originally formed part of a sermon which he preached and published in Princeton, N.J., just before removing to Tennessee.

in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.”

Gen. vii. 21, 22. “And all flesh died that moveth upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man: All in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died.” (Of course, all men now living, or who have since lived, are or were descended from Noah.)

Gen. ix. 18, 19, 25, 26, 27. “And the sons of Noah that went forth of the ark, were Shem, and Ham, and Japheth: and Ham is the father of Canaan. 19. These are the three sons of Noah: and of them was the whole earth overspread. 25. And he said, Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. 26. And he said, Blessed be the Lord God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant. 27. God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant.” (In the last three verses, we should probably read, “Ham, the father of Canaan.”)

Acts, xvii. 26. “And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation.”

Ps. lxxviii. 31. “Princes shall come out of Egypt: Ethiopia shall soon stretch out her hands unto God.”

Ps. ii. 8. “Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.”

Ps. cii. 15. "So the heathen shall fear the name of the Lord: and all the kings of the earth thy glory."

Galatians, iii. 8. "And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed."

Luke, xxiv. 47. "And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."

Matt. xxviii. 19. "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Rev. xiv. 6, 7. "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation and kindred, and tongue, and people."

Mark, xvi. 15. "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."

Exod. xx. 5, 6. "For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; And showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments."

1. Consider the scriptural view of the divine government and various dispensations. Why the diversities of race? How accounted for? Parental sins visited upon children. Noachian prediction and malediction.

2. Slavery countenanced and regulated by law among the Hebrews. By Moses, etc. By Paul, etc.

3. The African at *home* and in America. Actual con-

dition of the negroes in Africa at the period when first transported as slaves to America. Their condition since, and at present,—not worse certainly than before, and in their native land. Sufferings and deaths, even by the horrid *middle passage*, far less than would have been endured at home. Where every species of cruel bondage, bloody sacrifice, prolonged torture, unmitigated, hopeless wretchedness—prevailed. War, death, slavery,—ever in prospect—at home. Without the slightest chance of improvement, amelioration, or eventual enlightenment. Are the negroes, at this moment, anywhere in the United States, as badly off as are their heathen kindred in Africa? Let the comparison be instituted and fairly conducted, etc.

4. The great design of Providence in causing or permitting their removal to America. History. Prophecy. How great changes or events are usually brought about. The negro had so far degenerated, had become so extremely debased, that a long course of discipline and apprenticeship was necessary to restore him to his primeval dignity and manhood. A schooling of some two hundred years, among the Anglo-Americans, has wrought marvels in their behalf. They have already become a renovated and superior race. Superior, I mean, when compared with the wild native of Africa. They have improved physically, morally, intellectually. They have advanced in civilization—in morals, religion, intelligence, industrial arts, political wisdom (or habit of imitation or experience or something which enables them to go ahead,)—as no barbarous or savage tribe had ever done

when left to themselves. Their case is *unique*—without a parallel. They have been increasing in numbers, and improving, like children at school, steadily and rapidly, while the native Indians have as rapidly disappeared—died out!

5. Without uttering a word, by way of apology or excuse or defence for the manner in which negroes have been treated and regarded by the *whites*, it may be justly said, in reference to the divine government and providence, that their violent deportation to America has proved to them and their race a great and permanent blessing. Even the rights of marriage—of husband and wife—of parent and child—are scarcely recognized in Africa. In these respects, therefore, they have lost nothing—at the very worst. Family ties, without the sanction of law, are respected by both master and slave far beyond the capacity of a pagan negro to comprehend. On this subject, our legislation is abominable. It must be abolished. The Christian code must be adopted and enforced. Still, the philanthropist, in comparing the lot of the American negro with that of the untutored African, will hardly hesitate to award the palm to the former. Especially when looking to—

6. Colonization. To Liberia. To the great African Republic. The counterpart of the United States. The model of civilization, Christianity and democratic self-government for a whole continent. Its actual state and progress and influence. Its probable results. Has the world ever seen the like? What modern enterprise to be compared with it in grandeur of conception or boldness

of execution? A few emancipated American slaves have achieved on the coast of Africa what no body of enlightened philosophers or zealous political champions of popular freedom have been able to effect in Europe or Spanish America—namely, to establish a republic *under the government of law*—like our own, etc.

How ought Liberia to be regarded by the Christian, the patriot, the statesman, the philanthropist—the friend of the negro as well as of the white man?

7. Opposition to the cause of colonization by abolitionists, has been overruled by kind Heaven to the ultimate benefit of Liberia. Otherwise there might have been too great and sudden a rush of emigrants to the Fatherland. The current in that direction perhaps needed a salutary check. The good work has, in consequence of unwise and bitter opposition, advanced slowly, but surely—until the great public is beginning to appreciate the enterprise, and to discern how the slave may be emancipated to the advantage alike of himself and his master.

8. Is slaveholding a sin *per se*? Abolitionists affirm: Southerners deny; and appeal to Moses and the Prophets—to Christ and the Apostles.

9. Who introduced slavery into this country? Who is guilty of the original sin? What government is criminal—and responsible for the enormity? The sin perpetrated—the calamity existing—the evil everywhere felt—what is to be done? What *can* be done, consistently with the dictates of humanity and Christianity? Is every man who owns a slave to be denounced as a monster? etc.

10. No man is required by law to own a slave, not even in the slave States. The most vehement opponent of slavery, therefore, may live unmolested, and with all the rights of conscience unimpaired, *quoad hoc*,—whatever notions may be entertained of the institution itself.

No person is compelled to buy, sell, or hold in bondage, a single slave in any part of the country,—of course, if conscientiously opposed to slavery, he can keep aloof from it.

11. Consider the multitude of negroes converted to the Christian faith while in bondage, etc.

12. The *white* race more damaged by slavery than the *black*.

13. Slavery recognized in the Decalogue. See fourth commandment.

14. Has the hearty opponent of slavery a right—*inherent or natural, constitutional or scriptural, prescriptive or conventional*,—to *resist* the lawful authorities in their execution of laws duly enacted to protect slave-owners, and to secure to them their property in slaves? etc.

15. The providential scope, tendency, and probable results of slavery, both here and in Africa. Emancipated slaves to become the pioneers of civilization and Christianity, etc.

16. Even while in slavery, the negro fares better, in all respects, than his brethren in Africa—both as to this life and the future.

17. This view of the subject does not justify or palliate a single act of cruelty or injustice on the part

of the master. Many bad men have been used as mere instruments to carry out the divine purposes, etc.

18. Abolitionists and ultra pro-slavery men equally at fault. And yet both will be made unwittingly to promote the grand designs of Jehovah. See Isaiah, x. 5, 6, 7. "O Assyrian, the rod of mine anger, and the staff in their hand is mine indignation. I will send him against an hypocritical nation, and against the people of my wrath will I give him a charge, to take the spoil, and to take the prey, and to tread them down like the mire of the streets. Howbeit he meaneth not so, neither doth his heart think so; but it is in his heart to destroy and cut off nations not a few," etc.

19. Free States are beginning to exclude negroes from their territory—as Indiana, etc.

20. Slave States will not suffer negroes to be emancipated except on condition of their removal from the State.

21. What will soon be the condition of *free* negroes in this country? What, if all were free? Is it possible for the negro *here* ever to become the equal of the white man—socially or politically?

22. Marriage—not recognized by law among slaves. Husbands and wives, parents and children, are separated, and sold far away from each other. Very harsh, cruel and unchristian, no doubt. Still, not worse than in Africa. How is marriage regarded there? Do parents never sell their children—even to slave-dealers?

So far as mere separation is concerned, the *slave* is not worse off than the soldier and sailor. Naval officers,

even, of the highest rank, may be ordered on service in remote seas, and be absent many years, etc.

The separation, by sale, of negro husband and wife, is a *divorce*—a virtual and actual dissolution of the marriage contract or relation—as much so, as if one of the parties had died.

They may, as they do, marry again. This is allowed by custom, by law, by reason, and by religion. Whatever of *sin* may be involved in the affair, attaches to the master or to the government.

23. Slavery will not cease—even at the *millennium*. It will become more patriarchal—and be purified from its present abominations, etc.

24. The late “Fugitive Slave Law” (so called) has given rise to an immense deal of discussion—political, ethical, and theological. On this theme, I remark—

1st. Obedience to civil government is a Christian duty.

2d. Except when it conflicts with the divine government or law, as clearly revealed in Scripture. We must obey God rather than men.

3d. Conscience to decide. Every man for himself.

4th. When we cannot conscientiously *obey*, we must *submit*—as did Christ, and all holy men of old. We must endure the penalty of *non-obedience*—as did the apostles and martyrs—as do the Quakers now, etc.

25. Negroes are everywhere learning to read, in spite of the laws which forbid their instruction. What does this fact indicate, as to the capacity and probable progress of the negro race in science, literature and art?

26. The present condition of Liberia. Its industrial

and commercial prosperity. Its legislation and jurisprudence. Its public men—from the able president down to the humblest village magistrate. Its schools, churches, newspapers,—morals, intelligence, sobriety, religion, social intercourse. What say all travellers of this wonderful Republic?

27. Distinguish between the legitimate tendency and influence of Christianity towards the gradual amelioration of humanity and the actual state of mankind in the time of Christ, and ever since. The evils of slavery to be abated or exterminated—like those of intemperance, war, ignorance, oppression and injustice of every kind.

28. Hitherto, and at present, the negroes have been, and are, better off in a state of slavery than in a state of freedom. While ignorant, feeble, degraded; they need protection and instruction. They would soon perish out of the land, if set free, and left to take care of themselves.

An *inferior* race can never long exist in the midst of a *superior*, upon equal terms. The first must be dependent on, and protected by the latter, or they will soon waste away—especially when amalgamation cannot take place—and where intermarriages would not obliterate the distinctions of caste or colour. Witness the fate of the native Indian; and of the negro in the free States.

FREE BANKS—STATE STOCK BANKS.

OBJECTIONS TO SUCH BANKS.

1. BANKS *based* on a deposit of what are called government stocks—whether National or State bonds, *i.e.* mere evidences of National or State debts—are virtually allowed a great privilege denied to the people generally. They are allowed at least double interest. They receive the usual interest accruing from the stocks or bonds deposited, and also from an equal amount of their own notes, issued as money, in the shape of bank bills or promises to pay the bearer on demand. Thus, for every hundred dollars deposited, they receive, say six per cent., and also, six per cent. or more for another hundred of their own paper—making *twelve* or *more* per cent. for every hundred dollars of *bona fide* capital; while the ordinary citizen (not a shareholder in any such bank) can get, according to law, only six per cent. for the loan of his own real capital in the form of gold and silver—that is, actual cash, or specie, or constitutional money.

2. Why should *State stocks*, or any other evidences of public debts, be preferred as the *basis* of a bank, rather than other kinds of property? and more especially real estate? Could not the latter be converted into money, as readily as stocks—at some price? say at half its estimated or market value? Let the cash valuation of a

farm be ten thousand dollars,—in any exigency, it would certainly command five thousand:—why not permit the farmer to issue his *quasi* bank notes to the amount of five thousand dollars, besides working his farm, and getting from it all he can? But even this would not place him on an equality with the stockholder in a *free bank* of Indiana; for he may put *State stock* at *par* into a bank—and issue an equal amount of his own paper—without regard to fluctuations in the market. Thus even now, (December, 1854,) most of the stocks deposited at 100 are selling at 75 or 80; and, of course, are insufficient to redeem the bills in circulation. I suppose a landed security would have proved more reliable—but the truth is, that nothing except gold and silver (*i.e.* money) can serve as a safe basis for banking operations,—because payment is always to be made *on demand*, and not on the cash sale of stocks or land or any other commodity or species of property.

3. To establish the eighty-seven free banks of Indiana, some seven or eight millions of *cash funds* (gold and silver, or their equivalent in some other form,) were actually sent away from the State to New York or other remote cities to purchase the needful stocks—thereby diminishing, to that amount, the actual available capital of the commonwealth, to be replaced by the issue of seven or eight millions of doubtful and constantly depreciating paper currency. Thus, on a trial of about six months, some of the banks have already failed or suspended payment, and the paper of others is selling at a discount of from ten to thirty per cent.

4. The attempt to build up a bank upon a debt—to create something out of nothing—to hazard debts to individuals upon State debts—looks very like an absurdity. If it could be assumed *as certain* that all the stocks pledged for the redemption of the bills issued, could be instantly converted into cash at their par value, there would be reason in the thing; but all experience shows that whenever there is a stringent demand for money—*specie*—then stocks, as well as other property, will sink or fall in price.

5. Consider the vast expense of maintaining any system of banking:—the numerous officials employed at large salaries—the presidents, cashiers, tellers, clerks, runners, attorneys, agents, collectors; the banking-houses, fixtures, engraved plates, stationery. Compute the expense of the whole machinery for furnishing the people with a substitute for the constitutional currency. How much does it cost? There are already eighty-seven free banks in operation, and others are being daily established, and there are thirteen other banks—making one hundred in all for Indiana. There are probably not less than three thousand banks of all sorts in the United States—employing some twelve or more thousand officers and servants—to say nothing of directors—and at a cost to the people of fifteen or twenty millions annually. Now this entire host of *genteel* workingmen, and this enormous expenditure of annual millions, do not produce a dollar, or add a dollar to the actual wealth or capital of the State or of the Union. People are continually deluded and mystified with the fancy that banks can

make money plenty—that they possess some magical or creative powers.

6. But we are gravely assured, in the newspapers, that there is no cause for alarm or for a panic—that, at the worst, the noteholders need not lose more than from ten to twenty per cent., if they will only be patient, have faith, and wait for the sale of the stocks deposited at Indianapolis. Why should they lose a cent or wait an hour? Again, we are told, that the banks are rapidly calling in and redeeming their paper, and that their circulation has already been reduced to about one-half of the original issue, or by some three or four millions—and that therefore we may dismiss all fear for the future. This is proof at least that there was abundant ground for fear, distrust and alarm—and hence the attempt to apply the only practicable remedy. But this remedy comes too late for the relief of the poor noteholders of a few dollars, needed for their daily bread—and which must be sacrificed for whatever they can get. Capitalists, speculators, merchants, brokers, may profit by the purchase of such bills at an enormous discount, *i.e.* by *shaving* the necessitous. The poor widow, for example, who last evening received her hard-earned pay in a one-dollar bill (of the Connorsville Bank or any similar concern) goes to the market this morning to buy the necessary food for herself and children,—and is told by the butcher that her note won't pass, that the bank has just closed its doors, etc.—What can she do? Why, just take whatever she can get, rather than starve, say fifty or twenty-five cents.

7. The fundamental error, fallacy, sophism, absurdity of the whole system, would be obvious, if, instead of *dollars*, the paper promises were to pay the bearer so many bags of cotton or barrels of flour or sugar or coffee, and when a demand is made for the promised commodity—lo and behold, the said article is not on hand and cannot be procured. Will it suffice to offer tobacco or whisky or horses, or land, or even gold?

8. I blame no one who honestly engages in such banking according to the letter and meaning of the law. If the law allows him twenty per cent. for the use of his capital, he has a right to the privilege, though withheld from his neighbour.*

* The Auditor of the State of Indiana, in November, 1854, informs the public that: "All the free bank paper is taken for State and County taxes in this State, except the following, viz.: Connerville, Northern Indiana, Drovers' Bank of Rome, Plymouth Bank of Plymouth, Traders' Bank of Terre Haute, and the State Stock Bank of Logansport." Again, he adds: "The circulation of all the [free stock] banks now is between three and four millions, but is daily growing less. The amount originally issued was between seven and eight millions." Again: "I am surrendering the bonds of all the banks to holders of their notes."

What must result from such enormous expansion and contraction of the popular currency? Already the pressure is heavy upon us—very like 1837.

The "Act to authorize and regulate the business of General Banking in Indiana," was approved May 28, 1852—to be in force from and after July 1, 1852. Most of the existing free banks, I believe, have gone into operation within the current year. Another, at *Paoli*, is to commence on the twentieth of this month, viz., December 20, 1854.

Each shareholder is held responsible in his individual capacity and private fortune to an amount equal to his stock subscription—and in addition to the public stock deposited at Indianapolis—for the redemption of the bills issued. But this provisional security will prove of little value in the case of foreign shareholders or those of other States: and of no value whatever when shareholders possess no other property.

RICHES—POVERTY.

THERE is a fashion of denouncing wealth and wealthy men, which is neither scriptural nor judicious. I suppose wealth may be righteously or honestly inherited, acquired, possessed, enjoyed, etc. The Bible, surely, encourages and enjoins the practice of all the virtues which contribute to worldly prosperity, and abounds in examples of *good* men who became rich. Thus, diligence, economy, sobriety, etc. are inculcated; while Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Job, Moses, Joseph, Ruth, Esther, David, Daniel, etc. were examples in point. Good men were often tried by both prosperity and adversity—by poverty and wealth—neither desirable in the extreme. *Religion* is the principal concern—the one thing absolutely and pre-eminently needful. Hence the exhortation or command of Christ: “But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you.” (Matt. vi. 33; see, also, 1 Tim. iv. 8.)

The acquisition of wealth by unlawful means or for unlawful ends, is, of course, sternly condemned. We are to use the world, but not to abuse it. “And they that use this world, as not abusing it.” (1 Cor. vii. 31.)

The inordinate pursuit of wealth, or of any mere earthly good, is forbidden. Covetousness is idolatry. See Coloss. iii. 5: “and covetousness, which is idolatry.”

“Labour not to be rich; cease from thine own wisdom.” (Prov. xxiii. 4.) “Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth,” etc. (Matt. vi. 19, 20, 21.)

“Treasures of wickedness profit nothing: but righteousness delivereth from death.” “The Lord will not suffer the soul of the righteous to famish: but he casteth away the substance of the wicked.” (Prov. x. 2, 3.) “An inheritance may be gotten hastily at the beginning; but the end thereof shall not be blessed.” (Prov. xx. 21.) “The getting of treasures by a lying tongue is a vanity tossed to and fro of them that seek death.” (Prov. xxi. 6.) “A faithful man should abound with blessings: but he that maketh haste to be rich shall not be innocent.” (Prov. xxviii. 20.)

“Trust not in oppression, and become not vain in robbery: if riches increase, set not your heart upon them.” (Ps. lxii. 10.)

“He that trusteth in his riches shall fall: but the righteous shall flourish as a branch.” (Prov. xi. 28.)

* * “how hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God!” (Mark, x. 24; see Matt. xix. 21, etc., Luke, xviii. 23, etc.)

“Charge them that are rich in this world that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy.” (1 Tim. vi. 17.)

“Riches profit not in the day of wrath; but righteousness delivereth from death.” (Prov. xi. 4.)

“There is an evil which I have seen under the sun, and it is common among men;

“A man to whom God hath given riches, wealth and honour, so that he wanteth nothing for his soul of all that he desireth, yet God giveth him not power to eat thereof, but a stranger eateth it. This is vanity, and it is an evil disease.” (Eccl. vi. 1, 2.)

“In the house of the righteous is much treasure: but in the revenues of the wicked is trouble.” (Prov. xv. 6.)

“He that loveth silver shall not be satisfied with silver; nor he that loveth abundance with increase.” (Eccl. v. 10.)

“Surely every man walketh in a vain show; surely they are disquieted in vain: he heapeth up riches, and knoweth not who shall gather them.” (Ps. xxxix. vi.)

“Wilt thou set thine eyes upon that which is not? for riches certainly make themselves wings; they fly away as an eagle toward heaven.” (Prov. xxiii. 5.)

“He that hasteth to be rich hath an evil eye, and considereth not that poverty shall come upon him.” (Prov. xxviii. 22.)

“Remove far from me vanity and lies: give me neither poverty nor riches; feed me with food convenient for me: Lest I be full, and deny thee, and say, Who is the Lord? or lest I be poor, and steal, and take the name of my God in vain.” (Prov. xxx. 8, 9.) “Give us this day our daily bread.” (Matt. vi. 11.) “A little that a righteous man hath is better than the riches of many wicked.” (Ps. xxxvii. 16.) “There is that maketh himself rich, yet hath nothing: there is that maketh himself poor, yet hath great riches.” (Prov. xiii. 7.)

“Better is little with the fear of the Lord, than great treasure and trouble therewith.” (Prov. xv. 16.)

“Better is a little with righteousness, than great revenues without right.” (Prov. xvi. 8.)

“Better is the poor that walketh in his uprightness, than he that is perverse in his ways, though he be rich.” (Prov. xxviii. 6.)

“Better is a handful with quietness, than both the hands full with travail and vexation of spirit.” (Eccl. iv. 5.)

“I have been young, and now am old; yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread.” (Ps. xxxvii. 25.) * * “but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come.” (1 Tim. iv. 8.)

“For the poor shall never cease out of the land: therefore I command thee, saying, Thou shalt open thine hand wide unto thy brother, to thy poor, and to thy needy, in thy land.” (Deut. xv. 11.)

“Whoso mocketh the poor reproacheth his Maker; and he that is glad at calamities shall not be unpunished.” (Prov. xvii. 5.)

“For ye have the poor always with you; but me ye have not always.” (Matt. xxvi. 11; also, Mark, xiv. 7.)

DILIGENCE in business commended—and IDLENESS denounced.

“Six days thou shalt labour, and do all thy work.” (Deut. v. 13.)

“Love not sleep, lest thou come to poverty: open thine eyes, and thou shalt be satisfied with bread.” (Prov. xx. 13.)

“Be thou diligent to know the state of thy flocks, and

look well to thy herds: For riches are not for ever: and doth the crown endure to every generation?" (Prov. xxvii. 23, 24.)

"And the man Jeroboam was a mighty man of valour; and Solomon seeing the young man that he was industrious, he made him ruler over all the charge of the house of Joseph." (1 Kings, xi. 28.)

"The thoughts of the diligent tend only to plenteousness; but every one that is hasty only to want." (Prov. xxi. 5.)

"Seest thou a man diligent in his business? he shall stand before kings; he shall not stand before mean men." (Prov. xxii. 29.)

"She looketh well to the ways of her household, and eateth not the bread of idleness." (Prov. xxxi. 27.)

"He becometh poor that dealeth with a slack hand: but the hand of the diligent maketh rich." (Prov. x. 4.)

"He that gathereth in summer is a wise son: but he that sleepeth in harvest is a son that causeth shame." (Prov. x. 5.)

"The hand of the diligent shall bear rule: but the slothful shall be under tribute." (Prov. xii. 24.)

"The soul of the sluggard desireth, and hath nothing, but the soul of the diligent shall be made fat." (Prov. xiii. 4.)

"The way of the slothful man is as a hedge of thorns: but the way of the righteous is made plain." (Prov. xv. 19.)

"He that tilleth his land shall have plenty of bread;

but he that followeth after vain persons shall have poverty enough." (Prov. xxviii. 19.)

"He also that is slothful in his work is brother to him that is a great waster." (Prov. xviii. 9.)

"The slothful man saith, There is a lion without, I shall be slain in the streets." (Prov. xxii. 13.)

"The slothful man saith, There is a lion in the way, a lion is in the streets." (Prov. xxvi. 13.)

"The sluggard is wiser in his own conceit than seven men that can render a reason." (Prov. xxvi. 16.)

"I went by the field of the slothful," etc. (Prov. xxiv. 30, 31, 32.)

"Go to the ant, thou sluggard," etc. (Prov. vi. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.)

"Slothfulness casteth into a deep sleep; and an idle soul shall suffer hunger." (Prov. xix. 15.)

"The sluggard will not plow by reason of the cold; therefore shall he beg in harvest, and have nothing." (Prov. xx. 4.)

"For the drunkard and the glutton shall come to poverty: and drowsiness shall clothe a man with rags." (Prov. xxiii. 21.)

"Yet a little sleep, a little slumber, a little folding of the hands to sleep: so shall thy poverty come as one that travelleth and thy want as an armed man." (Prov. xxiv. 33, 34.)

"He that loveth pleasure shall be a poor man; he that loveth wine and oil shall not be rich." (Prov. xxi. 17.)

"When they were filled, he said unto his disciples,

Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost." (John, vi. 12.)

"But if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel." (1 Tim. v. 8.)

"Not slothful in business; fervent in spirit; serving the Lord." (Rom. xii. 11.)

"For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat." (2 Thess. iii. 10.)

"And he said unto them, Take heed and beware of covetousness: for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." (Luke, xii. 15.)

"Let no man seek his own, but every man another's wealth." (1 Cor. x. 24.)

"Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on things of others." (Phil. ii. 4.)

"But they that will be rich fall into temptation, and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition." (1 Tim. vi. 9.)

"For the love of money is the root of all evil; which, while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows." (1 Tim. vi. 10.) * * "neither shalt thou covet thy neighbour's house," etc. (Deut. v. 21.)

The poor man is quite as likely to covet—and to be covetous—to be dishonest, venal, selfish, false, deceitful, reckless,—as the rich. Who are the most useful members of society? Not the idle, intemperate, careless, profligate, thriftless, do-nothing, beggarly, classes or

individuals. In our country there is no poor *caste*—like the peasantry or serfs of Europe. No healthy man, who is industrious, sober, frugal, virtuous and persevering, need ever be a pauper, or a dependant on the charities of others. He can and will create a path to manly independence. Our richest and worthiest citizens have made their own fortunes and risen to eminence in Church or State by their own efforts and enterprise. These constitute the best portion of our citizens. They have made our country what it is—the most beautiful, flourishing, abundant and prosperous of all lands; the home of the persecuted and oppressed of every nation. Hopeless, invincible, incurable poverty among us, is the result of sheer idleness or vice. A drunken husband and father may render a wife and children miserable and the proper objects of charity and beneficence. And there will ever be sufferers from sickness or misfortune—requiring aid, etc. The poor widow and orphan must be cared for.

Demagogues in the pulpit, at the hustings, in the halls of legislation, and at popular meetings of all sorts, are very much in the habit of declaiming against the rich—as if they were criminal oppressors of the poor—as if they had amassed their wealth by dishonest means or by hard dealing with the poor, etc. And thus they strive to create and keep up sentiments of hostility towards the rich, as the natural enemies of the poor, etc.

Nine-tenths of the paupers in our cities are foreigners—and most of them Romanists, etc.

The terms *wealth*, *riches*, etc., are comparative. The

possessor of a few thousands in the country is accounted *rich*—while in the large cities, scores and hundreds of thousands would be required to entitle a man to such enviable distinction. Thus, I read in the American Messenger of January, 1855, that the income of William B. Astor, of New York, is one million two hundred thousand dollars *per annum*. Again, in the New York Observer of December 28, 1854, it is said: “The estate of the late Anson G. Phelps foots up at \$2,500,000, (two and a half millions.) He was a Connecticut boy, and carried nothing but his hands and brains to New York.”

“The tax of Nicholas Longworth, of Cincinnati, amounts this year to \$40,000.” (N. A. Tribune of Jan. 5, 1855.)

All combinations of mechanics, tradesmen and labourers to establish arbitrary or fixed prices for work or commodities—and *strikes* for higher wages—are unwise, impolitic, anti-republican, and greatly injurious to the parties intended to be benefited. It is a self-imposed check upon industry, economy, enterprise and wholesome competition. It reduces all to a dead level. It is opposed to the principle of free trade and free action. Why should not the employer and the employed, in all cases, be at liberty to make their own contracts without fear or control—without dread of frown or penalty from any club or association, or of violence under Lynch law? Look too at the expense—the tax actually levied upon the members—of every such combination. The loss of time—idle and wasteful habits acquired—the discouragement of all manly aspi-

rations, of all self-reliance, of all desire or effort towards an advanced or improved condition, etc. "Live, and let live." Let every man be free to work—free to earn, to save, to enjoy the fruit of his labours—to become rich if he will or if he can. Let the law protect him in all honest pursuits—and encourage him to better his condition by virtuous industry, economy and enterprise.

Again, the labouring and poorer classes are exceedingly prone to join various expensive (and often demoralizing) associations—such as Freemason, Oddfellows, Washingtonian, and others political or military, or merely festive. Even the ordinary city fire companies are so organized as to become burdensome to the members. Compute the waste of time in their public meetings and parades and celebrations—and at the funerals of their brethren—the cost of uniform or distinctive dresses, insignia, regalia, etc.

Every city has its volunteer finely equipped militia companies—of no manner of use, except to show off in the streets, and to pay large bills at hotels, etc. Here, in New Albany, on the 8th of January, 1855, the "Spencer Greys," headed by the "Banner Band," "turned out on a dress parade and target excursion. Their beautiful and soldierly appearance attracted great admiration. In the evening the 'Greys,' with the 'Banner Band,' and a number of invited guests, sat down to a magnificent supper at the De Pauw House," etc. Thus (and much more) writes the Editor of the New Albany Daily Tribune of this morning—Jan. 10, 1855. I happened to witness a part of the street *spectacle*, and

thought it rather a sorry affair. At midnight, I was aroused from sleep by a tremendous uproar in the street, occasioned by the light-headed "Greys" after supper, etc.

The *poor* also in cities frequent the theatre, circus, balls, musical concerts, dancing parties, drinking shops, gambling houses, and all sorts of amusements, shows, frolics,—of fun, folly, vice and ruin. Our cities are filled with European paupers—and the New York papers abound in descriptions of suffering, wretchedness, destitution and beggary, without a parallel hitherto in our country. The city is threatened with violence by the starving poor, etc. It is now midwinter, (Jan. 11, 1855,) and the dread of riots, tumults, mobs, etc. is daily increasing.

Among the plans of aiding the suffering poor, are balls, concerts, fairs, etc.—the net proceeds to be appropriated to their relief. This is bad, mischievous, unchristian. It is holding out a premium to folly, mirth, expensive extravagance and dissipation, under the garb and plea of charity, benevolence, philanthropy, etc. But small sums are raised in this way at best, compared with the amount actually expended in getting up such fashionable amusements. Why not give the whole and dispense with amusement altogether? Our good church-going people seem to think that, in this case at least, the end will sanctify or justify the means. Or that it is lawful to do evil that good may come, etc.

Poverty is nowhere represented in Scripture as a desirable state. But like sickness, blindness, deafness,

persecution—it is regarded and treated as a misfortune or a punishment.

That some men may be providentially called to labour without any visible means of support, is most true:—as were the apostles, evangelists, and many of the primitive Christians: and as are not a few of the ministers and missionaries of our own times. All such have a right to trust in God for their daily bread and for the supply of their daily wants. It is both their duty and their privilege. They live by faith, etc.

But even in the days of Christ and the Apostles, men were not condemned merely because they were rich or powerful—as in the case of Herod, Agrippa, Festus, Felix, etc. Nor were the rich required to become poor when they became converts to the Christian faith—as witness Cornelius.

Even Ananias and Sapphira were doomed to death, not for possessing wealth, but for lying to the Holy Ghost, etc.

The instance of the rich young ruler, as given by Mark, (chap. x. 17 to 21,) and by Luke, (chap. xviii. 18 to 23,) is no exception to the general rule or fact or doctrine. The above young man appealed to Jesus for direction, as to one whose authority he fully acknowledged, and whose instructions or commands he was therefore bound to obey. And Jesus, knowing the deceitfulness of his heart, and the vanity of all his pretensions to a legal righteousness, imposed a trial or test which would clearly demonstrate his real character, etc. None but He, or those inspired by His Spirit,

could do this, or be justified in the attempt to do it. A most important truth or principle, of universal application, is undoubtedly inculcated by the divine Master: namely, the danger of riches or of trusting in riches; and the duty of instantly relinquishing wealth and every earthly distinction when in conflict with our obedience to God.

On the subject of educating the poor—of providing for their wants—and of ameliorating their condition—many seasonable and sensible remarks may be found in Chalmers. See Chapter 14,—“On a compulsory provision for the indigent”—and Chapter 15,—“On the Christian education of the people”—of the “Political Economy” of Thomas Chalmers, D.D.

See a good article in Hall’s *Journal of Health* for Dec., 1854, on “Health, Wealth and Religion.”

“So likewise, whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple,” Luke xiv. 33. “If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple.” Luke xiv. 26.

Of course, whenever the alternative or choice lies between Christ and the world—its wealth, honours, domestic relations or life itself—we must abandon all for Christ.

THE WHISTLE.*

[This and the next eleven articles, as indicated by a note in the author's manuscript, "form but a few of many scores of *light essays*" which he occasionally furnished the newspapers in Nashville, over various signatures and upon all sorts of topics. Indeed, in his high estimate of the press as a vehicle of instruction, he was in the habit of reproducing his longer discourses in a series of short essays in the newspapers.]

"DISTANCE lends enchantment to the view," is not a mere poetical fancy—it is a serious practical fallacy, which is constantly imposing on our good people in sundry forms and ways. We rarely value what is at home and within everybody's reach. Our own substantial manufactures—our native literature—our domestic customs, fashions and institutions—all are comparatively worthless, insipid, ungentleel or vulgar. We look abroad—across the ocean—or to the far East—for whatever is beautiful, classical, ingenious or tasteful. Is a youth to be educated in *grand* style? He must, forsooth, be sent on a pilgrimage to some celebrated *Athens* beyond the Great Mountains—there to *renown* as a *Southern*, with plenty of cash and credit, half a dozen years, until he shall be proclaimed *moribus inculpatus, literisque humanioribus imbutus* by the grave, veracious and most *disinterested Senatus Academicus* of the said metropolitan Headquarters of Minerva and the Muses.

* Printed in the *Nashville Herald*, December 8, 1831, over the signature of F. G. F.

It is not to be presumed that a young *gentleman* can be accomplished in Greek or philosophy this side of the Potomac, or at a less cost than a thousand dollars per year. Parents and the public generally, are prone to estimate intellectual furniture, as they do all other things, by the price paid for the commodity. Thus, two thousand dollars' worth of learning must, of course, be tenfold greater in amount and value than two hundred dollars' worth. The latter may be easily attained *here* in the backwoods—but then it is not a thing to talk about and to boast of—it is an every-day affair—it confers no eclat—creates no sensation—makes nobody stare—attracts no particular notice—and commands no admiration.

Men, as well as children, often pay dear for their *whistles*. There are, at this time, at least five hundred Southern and Western youth at Eastern Seminaries—where they expend annually half a million of dollars to encourage and sustain a foreign monopoly of education; while our patriotic and economical sages never dream of adopting any measures to retain this vast amount of wealth within their own States. Nor do they seem to have suspected that the money thus squandered abroad, during every ten years, would amply endow as many first-rate colleges at home as would meet the wants of all their fellow-citizens for a century to come. The Southern funds lavished upon Cambridge and New Haven alone, in a single year, would create a university equal to Harvard or Yale in any part of our Southern or Western wilderness. Whether colleges are de-

signed for the rich or the poor—for wise men or fools—it matters not; they will be frequented; and if not established upon the banks of the Ohio, the Mississippi or the Cumberland, our dollars will continue, as hitherto, to adorn and enrich the banks of the Delaware, the Hudson and the Connecticut.

But, after all, would a *home* college be patronized? Could our *genteel* people be made to believe that their sons might be educated as well in Tennessee, for example, as in Massachusetts? Would not an Eastern graduate be looked up to as a superior animal? and would not he look down upon the plain home-bred native as a barbarian and a sciolist? Public opinion is omnipotent. It cannot be resisted or controlled. Solomon himself would be voted *non compos*, were he to prefer his claims in any other than the orthodox fashion—as settled by custom and usage. Were Oxford, with the glories of a thousand years, to be suddenly transplanted upon the picturesque hills which surround our fair village, it would be slighted and undervalued, so long as the *rage* is in favour of distant or foreign institutions.

Whether this folly will last forever, I leave *sub judice*. That there are pretty strong indications of its present existence, I infer from the fact that we have at our doors a university, which intelligent strangers never fail to compliment in the highest terms, and to pronounce superior in many respects to most of those which are famous at the East,—while it is scarcely known to our own citizens, and, in comparison with their magnificent penitentiary, is regarded as a very small concern. I infer the exist-

ence of this or some other folly also from the fact, that we have amongst us so many juvenile *idlers* of one sort and another, between the ages of fifteen and twenty, who appear to be utterly unconscious of the vicinity of an establishment purposely designed for intellectual improvement,—or who neglect it because it may not yet have acquired a European or national reputation.

Here, for instance, is a well constructed and richly furnished chemical laboratory—an apparatus for every department of experimental science—a cabinet of mineralogy and natural history unsurpassed by any in the United States,—where the laws of the universe, the structure and formations of the earth, the products of the field, the forest, the mine, the ocean, the air—with all the curious phenomena of nature and art—may be studied under the most auspicious circumstances and at the least possible expense. Why do not professional students and the younger graduates avail themselves of privileges which they could not command, at this moment, for any money, even in the largest Eastern city? Presently, the golden opportunity will have passed away; and they will regret through life, their deficiency in those varied literary and scientific stores which are essential to the highest order of influence and usefulness, and which might *now* be so easily accumulated.

Here they may learn Greek—and Tennessee Greek is just as good as Yankee Greek—and when they have mastered Greek thoroughly, it will be a pleasure to learn any other language, ancient or modern. They may learn

Hebrew, too, and Latin—and with a knowledge of the Latin, the French, Spanish and Italian may each be *read* in a few months without much labour.

Here they may learn that much-lauded, and—among a money-making people—the chief of sciences, *vulgar arithmetic*—in such manner too as would rejoice the heart of any merchant, banker or usurer in Christendom. Here the whole range of Mathematics, theoretic and practical, up to the *ne plus ultra* of West Point perfection, may be gone over by the aspiring tyro with as much facility and delight as the boarding-school Miss runs through the last *Waverley*.

Here the philosopher's stone and the elixir of life—or the best substitute for both—will be put into the hands (or the upper stories) of all the clever lads who shall be duly initiated into the higher or *esoteric* mysteries by the long-headed magician of the laboratory.

Here, in short, lawyers, doctors, parsons, merchants, farmers, mechanics, artists, schoolmasters, surveyors, engineers, politicians, statesmen, judges, editors, poets, orators, Jackson men and Clay men—may all be trained up for their several destinations, and be fitted to act well their parts upon the grand theatre of human selfishness, intrigue, ambition and littleness; or in the humble vale of innocence, peace, benevolence, kindness and charity. *And cheaply, I ween, will ye buy your whistles.*

GENTEEL BEGGARS.*

MERRY Old England is said to be the most *gullible* country in the world. And London is the very paradise of quacks, empirics, mountebanks, rogues, fanatics, impostors and vagabonds of all sorts and degrees. We seem to have inherited the facile and credulous temperament which has characterized worthy John Bull in all ages. Our happy republic is an asylum not merely for the miserable and oppressed, but for the refuse of every prison and gallows in the whole world. Now and then a pirate or murderer is caught and hanged to be sure—but the chances of escape are as ten to one in favour of the cunning foreigner, whatever may have been his crimes or his occupation. If a London banking house, or jeweler's shop, the *boudoir* of a Dutch princess or Parisian belle, happen to be robbed—why, to this land of promise and charitable oblivion, the lucky swindlers instantly direct their flight, as if assured of a safe and honourable retreat. They have only to assume big names, to show off and spend their *shiners* freely, and they presently become all the rage. Our ladies never fail to smile graciously on wealth and family from abroad. A German baron, an Italian count, a Spanish

* Printed in the *National Banner*, December 16, 1831, over the signature of G. F. G.

don, an English sir, a French marquis—sweet creatures—they have only to say the word, and our blushing fair ones will accompany them forthwith to Hymen's altar, with all the confidence of young affection and romantic inspiration. Although it does occasionally turn out, that before the honey moon is well over, some unmannerly *Hays* gets the *gemman* by the collar and straight conducts him *volens volens* to ready furnished lodgings in Bridewell.

Well, I have seen Manchester clerks and *travellers* in our Eastern cities, assuming all the airs and knowing self-sufficiency and supercilious bearing of my lord's *valets* and footmen. I have seen them looked up to, and stared at, and run after, and caressed and feasted, and toasted, as veritable English *lions*—by our *great* folks. When will American republicans learn to respect themselves, and be too proud to be dazzled and befooled by the shadows and apery of glittering titles, which may be prefixed or appended to the names or tails of the veriest simpletons, blockheads or libertines in Christendom?

But *ad rem*. Our country is infested with a legion of impudent foreign beggars, who are prowling about like hungry wolves, and preying upon the very vitals of the body politic. They are absolutely extorting our hard earned dollars by the cart loads, and under the most absurd and mendacious pretexts.

One day comes a Turk, shipwrecked on the coast of Labrador or Cape Horn—no matter where—the further off the better. He can't speak a word of English, of

course. He thrusts a paper into your face, stands pensively mute, looks wise and prepossessing, and mighty honest. You read his tale of wo, certified by sundry well-known civil magistrates and learned professors—give him a dollar, and receive his silent but expressive benediction—and next day read in the gazette that the said forlorn, wandering, pennyless Turk is a downright, full-blooded, native Vermonter! He passes on however, from village to village, and enacts the same part everywhere with equal success. He is proclaimed as an impostor in every newspaper. Still, from Bennington to St. Louis, he contrives to cheat every man he meets with. He was here in Nashville about eighteen months ago, and honoured my lonely cottage with a call; and though I had read all about his Turkship a year before, yet I could not prevail on my lady purse-keeper to withhold the customary dollar. He seemed so ingenuous, so friendly, so like a Turk, so un-American, there was no resisting his appeal direct to the purse. His *lingo* too, when he *did* speak, was pure classical Arabic, as anybody could perceive—consequently he was well educated. He was perfectly genteel, and utterly above the servile artifices of vulgar beggars;—*ergo*, he was a son of the Grand Sultan, or a pasha (pacha) with three tails at least. And he *might* condescend to carry off a dozen or score of our lovely damsels to enliven his princely harem in the proud City of Constantine—and who *could* withstand such eloquent pretensions?

True, this pretty exquisite was but a home-bred

Yankee after all. Still, Yankee-like, he understood the foible of his countrymen, and knew precisely in what garb to address himself to their sympathies and to their vanity. He therefore went forth to seek adventures as a foreigner of rank. And he is probably going the rounds at this day.—If not as a Turkish heir apparent, yet as a Chinese Mandarin, or Hindu Pundit, or Egyptian Sheik, or Grecian Hospodar, or Wallachian Vaivode, or Polish General just escaped from the tender mercies of a Russian Court-martial.

Italian and Sicilian beggars have been traversing our country for some thirty years past. I have encountered the same individuals repeatedly. They are always provided with the most satisfactory and well-authenticated testimonials—of which, by-the-way, there is said to be a regular manufactory in Philadelphia, where all sorts of signatures and seals may be procured for a trifle. Their usual pretext is, that a village or convent has been destroyed by fire, an avalanche, a volcano, or an earthquake, and that they are deputed to solicit charity for the wretched survivors.

I was once waited on by a Russian (so he professed himself) whose papers were duly endorsed by the Mayor of New York—setting forth that a vessel, containing a number of his relatives and friends, had been captured in the Mediterranean and carried into Algiers, where they were sold as slaves, and urging every kind-hearted American to contribute his mite towards their redemption. He got a dollar from each of us—about a dozen at dinner at the time, and just after the first six bottles

of *champagne* had evanished. When a cup of coffee had somewhat regulated our charitable outgoings, we were not a little chagrined and vexed at the trick; but we took no particular pains to interrupt his gainful operations, and we had the satisfaction to find that all our neighbours, drunk or sober, had been equally stupid and generous.

Within the last three years, I have had two hundred and fifty-nine similar calls from shipwrecked Germans, Spaniards and Portuguese; from exiled patriots of every country, and from other unfortunates of all sorts, who protested by signs or by some kind of *Lingua Franca* that they could not speak English, and who had English papers and credentials to speak and lie for them.

About two weeks ago, a stout, hale, thickset, whiskered, brazen-faced, red-nosed scape-gallows came to my house, bolted in, made his bow and tried to be graceful and to sport the gentleman—handed me his book—like a lady's album in externals—which at first I refused to look at, as I knew his object instinctively and by the aid of phrenology—thanks to my sagacity and to this superlatively invaluable and never-to-be-sufficiently lauded queen of sciences. When I bid him “begone” in blunt English, and with a scowl and a stamp of the foot which would have annihilated anything human, he smiled like a cockney and affected not to understand me. He then mumbled a little French, and intimated that he could *parler Francois un peu, mais not un vor ov tam Anglois*. As I could not get rid of the Hercules by words, looks, or gestures, and feeling no special *penchant* to attempt it

vi et armis, I cast my eye at length and in despair over the pages of his manuscript book. He was described as an Italian patriot soldier, who had suffered all but martyrdom in the holy cause of liberty—had lost his last *sous*—and had finally been whisked across the ocean or through the air, (Dr. Faust or Mother Carey can tell how,) and set down, safe and sound, in the good City of Savannah; where his misfortunes and hair-breadth escapes by flood and field had excited the deepest sympathy. And so the names of lady and gentleman donors continued to fill his pages and his pockets all the way from Augusta, (whither he had a free passage and the best birth in a steamer,) through Georgia, the Creek *Nation*, and Tennessee, even unto Metropolitan Nashville. As I had not dined, I succeeded for once in keeping my cash.

Since the above, two wounded, maimed, crippled, wobegone, limping, groaning, pitiful, drunken old soldiers, who fought, as their story told, at New Orleans, on one side or t'other, and were all but killed in battle, and had been dying ever since, and who certainly would die before next morning unless my right worshipful honour would be pleased to bestow the needful to wet their whistles and mend their coats. Alas! what is to be done? What was our grand penitentiary built for? What are our lawyers and courts and legislature about?

THE SEASON.*

[DECEMBER 16, 1831.]

THE present will, probably, long be remembered as the cold winter, or, at any rate, as the cold December. Our oldest people tell us that the Cumberland River has never been completely frozen at this place but twice before:—viz., in 1786 and 1796. It is not to be inferred however from this fact, that the weather has not been sufficiently cold during any other winter to freeze ordinary rivers. The truth is, it requires more intensely severe and longer continued frost to congeal the waters of the Cumberland than to produce the same effect upon the Hudson or the Delaware. This is owing to the very high and almost perpendicular banks, and to the rapid current of our noble river. And to these two permanent causes, may be added the generally high state of the water at this season. At present, the river is not swollen beyond its ordinary summer level: and it is now completely bridged over with solid ice, so that the heaviest loaded wagons cross it in safety.

Since about the first instant, the mercury in Fahrenheit's thermometer has ranged, at sunrise, between several degrees below zero and ten above, and with

* Printed in the *National Banner*, over the signature of G. F. G.

very little increase of temperature during the day. On the morning of the 6th instant, it began to snow; and since the morning of the 7th, the snow has remained about ten inches deep without any apparent diminution. Even the roofs of the houses, with a southern exposure, continue covered as at first. Scarcely wind enough to rustle a leaf has been perceptible during all this period. This circumstance and a clear sky will account for the very bearable and rather bracing character of a Greenland atmosphere.

Many temporary sleighs have been suddenly got up, and our worthy citizens have tried to amuse themselves in Yankee style. But their rude vehicles are such pitiful caricatures of the comfortable and elegant establishments of the Northerners, that they can attain at best but a sorry notion, from this experiment, of the delightful mode of land-sailing, which renders a Northern winter the most joyous and social portion of the whole year.

This morning (Friday, Dec. 16,) the mercury stood at fourteen degeees below zero, on College Hill at sunrise, in the open air! What will the Bostonians say to this? Oh, for M. Chaubert's red hot oven! Sherry wine in decanters, in a closed sideboard, was nearly a solid mass of ice, in a well built brick house. How alcohol fared, I had no opportunity of ascertaining. Though accustomed to a Northern climate, having lived some thirty years within fifty miles of New York, I have never experienced such cold as this;—nor have I ever known a *cold spell* to last so long without some abatement.

I find, on referring to my memoranda, that on the 25th of January, 1821, in the City of New York, at three o'clock A.M., the thermometer was fourteen degrees below zero; and this was pronounced, in the city papers of the day, the severest weather experienced there for upwards of thirty years. At my own residence in the country, the thermometer was at the same time five degrees below zero, which is the lowest ever witnessed by myself until this morning. While writing this, I am seated close to a huge fire, with gloves, moccasins, and great coat on, and I can with difficulty keep my ink in a liquid state long enough to record the passing features of the moment.

I have now before me the last number of Brewster's Edinburgh Journal of Science, which contains an abstract of the meteorological observations made to the regents of the University of New York from 34 academies in different parts of the State for the year 1830; from which it appears that at Albany, the lowest point to which the mercury fell during the last year, was 12 degrees below zero; and at Erasmus Hall, near the City of New York, to only 4 above zero. The whole abstract would be worth republishing here, if I had leisure and warm fingers to copy it, or if space could be spared for it in the columns of a newspaper, at such a busy, political, fighting, bank-making and un-making crisis as the present.

PUNCH AND A BISHOP.*

I HAVE sometimes marvelled at the objections made by two classes of men against Temperance Societies. It is well known that it is required of every person, who becomes a member of a temperance society, to subscribe a constitution or rule which inhibits the use of distilled liquors altogether, except as a medicine. This subscription is, in all cases, perfectly voluntary, and is binding no longer than is agreeable to the subscribing party. He may erase his name whenever he pleases. Of course, nothing onerous, or calculated in any degree to lead him into temptation, is imposed or intended. A more perfectly free and discretionary obligation cannot be contrived or conceived. A man may become a member of a temperance society to-day from conscientious conviction—and if he see reason, either from his own frailty or otherwise, to withdraw to-morrow or next week, he is at liberty to do so. Temperance associations exercise no coercive authority whatever—they inflict no penalty—administer no censure—and denounce no party and no individuals. They invite all men to abstain from ardent spirits, and to avow publicly their determination to do so. But they neither abuse nor blame any mortal for standing aloof.

* Printed in the *Nashville Herald*, December 22, 1831, over the signature of F. G. F.

But, I confess, it does seem strange that political men should object to the voluntary obligation thus assumed, on the ground that it is unlawful or dangerous to promise not to drink whisky, when they do not hesitate to take an oath to perform all the duties of any office to which they may be appointed, according to the Constitution and the laws of their country.

And still more strange that religious men should object on similar grounds, when they have all most solemnly vowed before God and their church to believe certain articles of faith, and strictly to observe certain rules of conduct, and to abstain from sundry specified immoral practices. A man who can, with a good conscience, promise never to lie, steal, murder, or profane the name of his Maker, ought not to demur at promising not to drink ardent spirits, if the practice be injurious to himself or others. Besides, it is well known that the primitive Christians, as Pliny testifies, bound themselves by oath not to commit any criminal or immoral act whatever.

But as great names have a sort of magical influence with our plain, independent, reflecting republicans, we will cite one or two, out of a thousand which might be adduced, in behalf of the temperance cause. The Lord Bishop of London is Patron of the British and Foreign Temperance Society; and the Lord Mayor is one of its Vice-Presidents.

“An anecdote of the Lord Bishop of London is worth relating. He did not fall in with the temperance measures till after mature deliberation. After having con-

cluded so to do, and pledged himself to that effect, he gave a dinner to a numerous company of guests. At dinners of this description, it had been customary to have punch at the close. After the dinner under consideration had been finished, and a short pause had occurred, one of the guests finding no punch to come on, asked if it were not about time for the punch; upon which the bishop arose, and thus addressed the company: ‘Gentlemen, I am a member of a temperance society; I have become so after full consideration of the subject; and I cannot conscientiously sanction this practice any longer.’ The effect of this unexpected address from such a source, as might have been supposed, was astounding; and it cannot fail to give an impulse to the glorious cause of temperance throughout the civilized world.”

CHRISTMAS.*

[DECEMBER 25, 1831.]

THIS is the festival of the Christian Church, observed annually on the 25th day of December, in memory of the birth of Christ. Originally, it was strictly regarded by Christians as a *holy* day—and not as a mere holiday, as it is now but too generally esteemed by the mass of our people. Why, or by what imperceptible gradations, it has thus degenerated into a season of levity and mirth and frolic, I shall not attempt to explain. It is grateful to the pious heart to know that the day is not thus universally desecrated; and that, among many denominations of Christians, the sublime object of its primitive institution is still kept in view. The nativity and advent of the glorious Son of God is surely the most stupendous miracle of divine goodness and mercy which has ever yet been witnessed by the intelligent creation of the Almighty. To commemorate such an event is a privilege not to be too highly appreciated—and therefore not to be slighted without more than ordinary criminality. If ever there be occasion for pious gratitude, for holy aspirations, and for fervent hallelujas of praise, it is on the annual return of that ever-memorable day

* Printed in the *National Banner*, December 27, 1831, over the signature of G. F. G.

which beheld the brightness of the Father's glory veiled in humanity, and appearing as a messenger of peace and love, of pardon and reconciliation, among the wretched and guilty children of men. The tear of joy indeed may bedew the cheek of the admiring but self-condemned worshipper at Immanuel's feet—and loud anthems of devout thanksgiving may ascend to heaven from the lips of the assembled congregation:—but what heart can be indifferent or unmoved, or disposed to idle sportiveness or sinful pleasure at such a season?

Oft have I entered the consecrated temple of the Most High on this hallowed anniversary, and participated in silence but with unspeakable emotions, in all the solemn acts of praise and adoration, with which some Christians are wont to celebrate a Saviour's marvellous incarnation and infinite condescension. Whether it be religion, or superstition, or sentiment, or early association, or constitutional infirmity—I stop not to inquire. It is to me an occasion of delightful and vivid, though mournful excitement. Is there joy in grief—light in darkness—comfort in sorrow—peace in conflict—hope in despondency?—Here it is that I seem to realize more than the poet's dream, and to rise above the perils and miseries which flesh is heir to.

On Sunday morning last (Christmas) I instinctively directed my steps (as in happier days) to the Episcopal Church, and seated myself in a retired corner of the gallery, where I could conveniently see and hear whatever was likely to command or deserve attention. The church itself, with all its interior arrangements, is a

beautiful object, and is, at any time, worthy of notice. *Then*, it was tastefully ornamented with evergreens in the manner which venerable usage has, from the earliest ages of the church, rendered familiar and grateful to the eye. After a momentary glance at the *scenery*, and perceiving that the decorations had been got up after the good old orthodox fashion, I felt prepared to yield myself without reserve to the soothing and exalting influences which the varied services of the church, when well performed, are so admirably calculated to exert. Nor were my almost romantic anticipations marred or disappointed. The song of praise, accompanied by the deep-toned organ—the sacred lessons of the day judiciously read—the voice of prayer, distinct, solemn, impressive, devout — (and such prayers and confessions—the very language of penitence and supplication!)—and then the appropriate sermon by the able, pious and eloquent rector—all conspired to make me *feel* that an hour thus spent in the courts of the Lord is better than a thousand days or years vainly wasted in the tents or habitations of wickedness and folly. *Oh, si sic omnes!*

P.S.—I must here take leave—and I hope to give no offence—to animadvert upon a practice which is exceedingly annoying and unbecoming, to say the least of it. Persons of different ages and sizes—principally boys and young men—were constantly coming in and going out of the galleries, during the whole period of divine service. This practice prevails, I believe, to a shameful extent in all our churches. Parents ought to

teach their rude boys better manners: and young gentlemen may be reminded that common politeness requires them to behave with respectful decorum in every place of worship, and never to disturb an audience by an unnecessary word or movement. They ought to enter the church before the service commences, and never to leave it until after the benediction is pronounced.

Again, some gentlemen keep their hats on until they reach their pews—and put them on again as soon as they begin to retire. Would any *gentleman* wear his hat into the midst of a lady's drawing-room? This sort of *hattishness* seems peculiar to certain sections of our country. The first time I ever saw a man march up the aisle of a church with his hat on, (it was in Western Virginia, and the individual referred to was an elder and the chorister,) I was as much surprised as if he had made his *entree* on horseback. Since that period, I have often seen the preacher fairly mount the pulpit before he doffed his beaver.

THE AMERICAN IS A SPITTING ANIMAL.*

AT a late meeting of the Synod of West Tennessee, the subject of chewing, smoking, and snuffing tobacco was gravely discussed: and the use of this noxious weed, in each of the above modes, was finally condemned, I believe, without a dissenting voice. Many curious facts and anecdotes were well told on the occasion; and the deleterious influence of tobacco on the human system was ably demonstrated and aptly illustrated by both clergymen and physicians. I shall not attempt to detail the particulars, nor to report any of the speeches. I refer the ignorant and the skeptical, however, for information, to the luminous pages of our own Dr. Rush and of the English Dr. Clarke, the divine.

The habit of *spitting* acquired and rendered unavoidable by the practice of chewing tobacco, is so offensive to all well-bred people as to excite some surprise that *gentlemen* should continue it. To what extent the hospitable citizens of New York and Philadelphia are annoyed in this respect by their Western friends, whenever the latter travel Eastward, can scarcely be conceived by any who have not resided in one or the other

* Printed in the *Nashville Herald*, December 29, 1831, over the signature of F. G. F.

of those cities. How completely *horrifying* to a fashionable lady to see, in her elegant and superbly furnished drawing-room, the invited guest of her honoured spouse, from the far West, bespattering her brilliant mahogany, and marble and Brussels, with tobacco juice, as unceremoniously as he would inundate the plank floor of a log cabin! Western parsons are especially noted for their gifts in this species of holding forth; and they never fail, during their annual visits to Philadelphia, to leave an odour of their outpourings so remarkably impressive and affecting as seldom to be effaced or forgotten. Whether their pulpit displays are equally potential or memorable, my reminiscences do not enable me to decide.

The late eloquent Mr. Pinckney of Maryland, while minister at the Court of St. James, very soon discovered that his tobacco chewing was a most disgusting annoyance to every company which he frequented: and he had the good sense and the resolution to discontinue the filthy usage altogether. He became, in consequence, a much healthier and better-looking man, as well as a vastly more accomplished and acceptable representative of the New World in the eyes of the loyal and fastidious Londoners.

The other day at church, a well-dressed young fellow, while standing up in prayer time and leaning over into my pew, so wantonly besprinkled every part of my premises with his tobacco distillations, as fairly to put all devotion out of countenance, and make me wish for the *Amen*, as impatiently as ever did hungry urchin

during his puritan papa's long grace over a thanksgiving-day's dinner.

At the aforesaid meeting of synod, a reverend doctor from Alabama stated that, during a voyage, a few years since, from Liverpool to New York, it became a topic of conversation and inquiry among the passengers, English and American—what was the peculiar distinguishing trait or characteristic of the American?—It being acknowledged that they were very much alike in general. At length, a shrewd Englishman remarked that, in his judgment, (and he had many opportunities for observation and comparison,) the “American might *par excellence* be denominated a SPITTING ANIMAL.”

THE WEATHER AND SUNDRIES.*

[JANUARY 30, 1832.]

THE present winter will long be remembered on account of the intense, and hitherto unparalleled severity of the weather. When we recorded, in a neighbouring journal, the features of the cold December, we little anticipated another Greenland visitation in so short a space. But all the concentrated frosts of the Icy Poles have been let loose upon us, and have played such fantastic tricks with our Italian atmosphere that a Russian or Norwegian might here have fancied himself some twenty degrees north of his accustomed latitude. We have, indeed, had winter and summer in delightful contact. One day oppressively hot—the next as cold as if the sun had been instantaneously annihilated. What philosophy can explain such enigmatical phenomena, or build up a meteorological theory worthy of this most enlightened and system-making generation? Do heat and cold travel by steam or by railroads, or by any other modern improvements *in esse* or *in posse*? What is the *reforming* world coming to? A few more mortal inventions will convert our lovely planet into a blazing comet, or into a globe of ice—and we shall be all burnt up or frozen into statues—to be criticised and questioned

* Printed in the *Nashville Herald*, January 31, 1832, over the signature of An Old Field Pedagogue.

secundum artem by the Cuviers and Bucklands and Lyells of a future creation.

What think you, courteous Bostonian, of twenty degrees below zero, here in Nashville, forty miles nearer the equator than sultry Algiers? Nashville is in latitude $36^{\circ} 10'$ North, and Algiers $36^{\circ} 49'$. The weather of January up to the 24th, was mild enough: and a few days rather too warm. On the 18th, for example, the mercury in Fahrenheit rose to 72 degrees, and we began to think of gardening. On the 24th, however, in the afternoon, it began to snow and to blow furiously. The night was pinching. At daylight of the 25th, the thermometer stood at four degrees below zero—at 9 o'clock at five below—and during the day the *maximum* of its rise was only to one above zero. This was the coldest *average* day we ever experienced anywhere. We were nearly frozen in riding a quarter of a mile on horseback—though well-equipped with all manner of orthodox defensibles. And our juvenile greeklings looked like the very personification of *vox faucibus hæsit*: and we could not find in our hearts to scold them for not threading the mazes of Euclid or Euripides. Even Busby or Parr would have become gentle and torpid under such an influence. By-the-way, Old Nick was a fool, or he would have made Job a schoolmaster—and then, if he had not triumphed, we are no conjurers.

The morning of the 26th arrived—and lo, the thermometer stood at 18 degrees below zero at sunrise! And that our accuracy may not be questioned, we have received accounts from sundry persons residing within a

range of thirty miles around us, stating the thermometer to have been 16, 17, 18, 19, and even 20 degrees below zero. We pledge our veracity to the whole world and to all posterity that the facts are precisely as we announce them. On the 27th the mercury was, at daylight, twelve degrees below zero, as observed by us, and ten below as reported by others. On the morning of the 28th it was two above zero. About noon it began to snow again. And it is snowing still, in real Vermont style, while we are writing—that is to say, at half-past eight o'clock in the evening of this same 28th of January, 1832. How deep the snow will be to-morrow we cannot certainly tell, but we venture a rough guess that it will be about three feet seven inches or *thereby*, as the Scotch phrase it.

During the previous month of December, it will be remembered that the mercury was, several times, two or three degrees below zero, and that on the morning of the 16th it was 14 below. We had then about 25 days of uninterrupted Iceland weather—with snow ten inches deep and good sleighing for two weeks. Twenty degrees below zero would be considered an extraordinary affair, and would cause a wonderful sensation even at St. Petersburg.

It is remarkable that the winters of 1740, 1780, and 1820 were the coldest ever known in our country. During each, the bay and other waters about the City of New York were completely frozen over, and admitted of all sorts of land travelling. Of the two former we have often heard our fathers and grandfathers speak as

the hard winters. Of the last, (1820–21,) our own recollections are sufficiently vivid. Perhaps the *knowing ones* may make something out of this cycle of 40 years—let them try.

That our winters are gradually becoming milder, and that our climate is ameliorating, we utterly disbelieve. The clearing of our dense forests will render the seasons more inclement and uncertain. Our own experience satisfies us that the cold is greater on this side of the mountains than in the corresponding parallels of latitude along the Atlantic coast.

Tennessee is most unfortunately situated. It is liable to all possible changes and extremes,—to late frosts in spring and to early frosts in autumn; to blasting heats by day and to chilling damps by night; to every form and type of the torrid and frigid zones at all times and seasons. Nothing here ever reaches perfection. We have no good fruits—no good melons—no good sweet potatoes (nor Irish either)—no good wheat, beef, mutton, fish, fowl or venison—no good garden vegetables—no good butter, cheese or pumpkin pies,—nothing but cotton, tobacco, corn, whisky, negroes and swine, and these not worth the growing. Everything degenerates in Tennessee. Doctors are made by guess (anatomical dissection is a penitentiary offence)—lawyers by magic—parsons by inspiration—legislators by grog—merchants by mammon—farmers by necessity—editors and schoolmasters by St. Nicholas, to do penance for the sins of their youth—mechanics are too cunning to live amongst us. We cannot naturalize a shoemaker

or a tailor. We import our ploughs and saddle-bags. We send to England or Barbary for our horses—and to Mexico for our asses (a work of supererogation in all conscience.)—We get our *notions* from the Yankees—our fashions from travelling milliners and pedlars—our champagne from Newark—our flints, clocks and nutmegs from Connecticut. Our colleges and schools are like fires kindled upon icebergs—their light is scarcely visible before they are extinguished.

All the world here is migratory and fitful and chaotic, like the climate. We have players, buffoons, jugglers, rope-dancers, harlequins, giants, pigmies, caravans of wild beasts, circus-riders, fiddlers, tumblers, fire-eaters, steam-doctors, picture-venders, tooth-makers, panaceists—all sorts of lions, stars, showmen, lecturers, teachers and holders-forth—but they are birds of passage—they pocket our cash, and then are off by the first steamer.—We are fleeced by all the charlatanry and necromancy and impudence and craft and sciolism and knavery and cockneyism which can muster the locomotive ability to reach this most gullible, tropical, polar, nondescript, and uniformly variable territory of ours, whereof Nashville is, and ever will be, the splendid, golden, august, munificent, refined, literary, freezing and broiling metropolis.

AN OLD FIELD PEDAGOGUE.

P. S.—Monday, 30th. We were a little out in our guess about the snow-storm on Saturday evening. The snow was precisely five inches deep yesterday morning, and the thermometer at 30 degrees above zero.

NASHVILLE, BY A KENTUCKIAN.*

[NASHVILLE, JANUARY 12, 1832.]

I AM, Mr. Editor, a citizen of a remote part of Kentucky, and have hitherto enjoyed but slender means of knowing much about Tennessee. Indeed, my chief information has been derived from the common school geographies, and from a few occasional notices in the Kentucky papers. Business having recently called me to the South, I have spent about six weeks in Nashville and its vicinity. I need not attempt to describe to you *all* the surprise which I felt at the first sight of your beautiful city, and the many interesting objects which meet the stranger's eye at every turn. We, in Kentucky, have been so long in the habit of regarding Tennessee as a kind of semi-barbarous, illiterate, outlandish region, that I could scarcely credit the testimony of my senses, when I everywhere beheld unequivocal proofs and monuments of superior intelligence and cultivated taste. Can this, thought I, be the metropolis of an ignorant, wild, *rowdy* race of adventurers, who have not yet mastered the first elements of civilization?

But my astonishment was at its height, when, after a week's observation, I discovered that you possess a

* Printed in the *Nashville Republican*, January 12, 1832. N.B. The "laudatory reviews" referred to were written by myself.

really first rate university. I had some difficulty, I acknowledge, in making this discovery—or rather the discovery was owing to mere accident. For no person during the progress of my inquiries, ever hinted that such an institution existed among them. The bridge, the theatre, the churches, the market, the penitentiary, the steamboats, the courthouse, the hotels, the academy, the warehouses—were eagerly pointed out, and sometimes, with no little ostentation, by the worthy citizens with whom I happened to converse. But the university was never mentioned or alluded to. I stumbled upon it in the manner following.

In one of my usual morning rambles, without any other object in view than to see what was to be seen, I kept along Market Street until I ascended a hill of considerable elevation, half-a-mile distant perhaps from the public square, where my attention was presently arrested by the appearance of a number of well-dressed youths about the doors of a large brick edifice, and by sundry other indications which bespoke an establishment totally different from anything which I had been prepared to anticipate in that quarter. Without ceremony, I marched into the yard and mingled with the youths aforesaid, who, I soon learned, had just come out of their breakfast-room, and were in fact students of a university! They were perfectly polite, and seemed pleased to gratify my curiosity in every particular. In short, I examined the whole premises—was introduced to the professors—attended the lectures and recitations—spent an hour in the laboratory—looked at the

splendid apparatus, cabinets of mineralogy and natural history, library, etc. Returning to my hotel in the evening, I began to expatiate on the extraordinary advantages thus placed within reach of the youth of your city; when, to my utter amazement, no one of the large company present seemed to comprehend the scope of my remarks. That there was some sort of a school on College Hill, they did appear to admit—but of its nature and objects, of its fixtures and teachers, of its endowments and pretensions, they were as ignorant as I had myself been until within a few hours before. I have frequently since taken occasion to visit the college, and have become intimately acquainted with its arrangements, discipline, modes of instruction, and provisions of every kind for the improvement of its gentlemanly pupils. On the whole, I must in candour declare that I never was before so thoroughly satisfied with any similar establishment—and I have had opportunities of making tolerably fair comparisons. I have *studied* on the spot the character of the most celebrated Eastern colleges, and I flatter myself that I am neither a partial nor an incompetent judge.

My object however, in this hasty communication, is not to laud your college, but to inquire why it is so little known here at home—in Nashville—and in the country around. Can it be that the people are indifferent to education, or hostile to their own university? Have its patrons and friends ever taken the trouble to proclaim its merits to the people, and to excite their sympathies in its behalf? Do its officers never appear before the

public as speakers? Do they deliver no Inaugural or Baccalaureate addresses—no introductory lectures—no colonization, temperance or Bible society speeches? If they do, are their pieces published and dispersed far and wide among the people? Now, in Kentucky, every *public* address of a college instructor appears forthwith in print as matter of course, and may be found in every cottage in the commonwealth. To give one example. The Inaugural Address of the late President of Transylvania University was published not only in pamphlet form, but in every journal and newspaper, whether political, religious, literary or scientific, in Lexington, and I believe throughout the State. It was thence copied into many papers in the adjacent States: and I recollect to have been informed at the time that it was published entire in at least one of the Nashville gazettes. The same course is pursued in regard to the introductory lectures of our medical professors—and thus everybody becomes acquainted with their talents, principles and literary qualifications. I have seen, within a few days past, the most laudatory reviews of a Lexington “introductory,” in your City papers,—while not one of them contained a syllable about your own excellent university.

Your professors must either be culpably silent, or their productions must be deemed by your critical sages utterly worthless, or they must be singularly modest, or somebody must be at fault that nothing from their pens should ever reach the public eye. I tell you, Mr. Editor, that if the Tennesseans are like the Ken-

tuckians, their college will never assume its proper rank, until the newspaper press shall be fully enlisted in the cause, and its officers be made through it to speak to all the people. Had I depended on your citizens for my knowledge of the Nashville University, I should have gone home without even dreaming that it could possibly be equal to an ordinary Kentucky grammar school—perhaps even without having heard of its existence! I now leave you, resolved to send my own sons to be educated here, in preference to any other college in the Union.

A KENTUCKIAN.

A HINT TO THE EASTERNS.*

[JANUARY 17, 1832.]

IN the November number of the "Monthly American Journal of Geology and Natural Science," there occurs, at the conclusion of an elaborate article, the following remarkable passage,—“And whilst geology and other branches of natural history are cherished and taught in every public institution, devoted to education, in Europe; there is not, as far as we are informed—with one exception—an officiating professor of these attractive and useful branches of knowledge, in any of the universities or colleges of this country.”

With about equal propriety might one of our sapient backwoodsmen, who had never learned better, affirm that, *as far as he had been informed*, there is not, in the whole world, a city equal in size and magnificence to Nashville! What right has any man to assert in print, what is or what is not, in relation to any province or subject, about which he is not well informed? Because the Journal does not happen to know of more than one college where geology is taught, it proclaims, that this and the kindred sciences are neglected in all the other literary institutions of our republic. Is such logic inculcated in the *Novum Organum* of Bacon, or in the ponderous folios of the Stagyrte? I acquit the writer of

* Printed in the *Nashville Republican*, January 17, 1832.

any design to misrepresent facts:—he has doubtless sinned through sheer ignorance. But then it was his duty to have made himself acquainted with the actual condition of the American colleges, before he undertook to enlighten the world on the subject.

I beg to apprise the writer and the Eastern skeptics generally, that “geology and other branches of natural history are cherished and taught, by an officiating professor of these attractive and useful branches of knowledge,” in the University of Nashville—situate, lying and being in the State of Tennessee, and not far from the 36th degree of northern latitude. For the precise locality, I refer him to his favourite Tanner. In this institution, the learned and accomplished naturalist, Dr. G. Troost, is, and has been for several years past, the faithful, laborious and devoted professor of geology, mineralogy and natural history. Dr. Troost was a pupil of the celebrated Abbé Haüy of Paris, and his superior cannot be found on this continent. His cabinet of minerals contains at least ten thousand specimens—and is not, for any useful purpose, inferior to the *Gibbs* collection belonging to the college, which we presume to have been excepted in the sweeping flourish already cited.

It is our misfortune to live west of the mountains, where, it is taken for granted, ignorance and barbarism are destined to hold universal and perpetual sway. Pray, Mr. Editor, do tell the Philadelphians and Bostonians and Londoners, that we are not *all* “gander-pullers,” nor “gougers,” nor “regulators,” nor “half-horse and half-alligator.”—That some of us geologize, and

botanize, and read Greek, and talk French, and write poetry, and spout political economy.—That we receive, by every mail, loads of Scotch, English, French and Eastern periodicals of all sorts and upon all manner of subjects—scientific, literary, political, religious, miscellaneous.—And do tell Mr. Walsh in particular, that I have read the whole twelve volumes of the “Diplomatic Correspondence of the American Revolution,” edited by Mr. Sparks; and that I very heartily approve of his late review of the same—as also his seasonable article on the manufacture of silk. This Quarterly, by-the-way, is worthy of all praise.

I moreover entertain a favourable opinion, on the whole, of the Journal of Geology, and cheerfully recommend it to the patronage of our liberal and enlightened citizens. Though I most religiously believe we could get up a much better one here in Nashville, without the least assistance from abroad.

When I read, some time ago, Mr. Journal’s translation of Cicero’s recently discovered treatise *De Republica*, I confess, I formed no very flattering estimate of his talents or of his knowledge either of Latin or English. But *then* he was out of his element. He looks better among the mastodons and buffaloes and rattlesnakes and quartz and hornblende and anthracite with which he is now principally conversant. May he live a thousand years in peace, health and prosperity—and have a successful voyage to the golden metropolis of Captain Symmes’ central geological elysium!

TUCKAHOE.

PRINTERS' BLUNDERS.*

[JANUARY 18, 1832.]

ONE of the *little* miseries to which the poor scribblers for public journals are necessarily subjected, is the mortification of seeing their pieces inaccurately printed. This is oftentimes owing, no doubt, to the illegible *chirography* of the contributors themselves. The compositor is compelled to guess at the writer's meaning; and he is not to be blamed if he should not always be successful in his guesses. When I am made, therefore, to use a *word* which I had not written, I very charitably infer that the fault was in my unlucky manuscript; and lament that I had not been duly drilled in the *Carstarian* system. But when a sentence or a line is altogether omitted or misplaced, or when the punctuation and orthography are defective or erroneous, I charge the fault to the compositor or proof-reader, or to somebody whose business it was to have prevented it. I do not mean, on the present occasion, to specify *all* my own particular grievances on this score—though I might exhibit a pretty formidable list. The Nashville editors have been so uniformly courteous and indulgent, and they are so well skilled in all the niceties of authorship

* Printed in the *Nashville Herald*, January 18, 1832.

and typography, that I should be both ungrateful and hypercritical, were I to apply the least censure to them in their official capacity. They cannot look after everything, nor be responsible for the absolute mechanical perfection of every paragraph which appears in their papers.

Orthography, however, is one of the few arts to which my studious and critical attention has been directed for many long years past; and although my proficiency may not have equalled my zeal, I have nevertheless advanced so far into its mazy intricacies as to be extremely sensitive to every *known* violation of its acknowledged canons. Where words admit of two modes of spelling, I follow usage in preference to the dictionary. Thus, I write *judgment*, *public*, etc. instead of judgement, publick, etc. *Birth* often occurs in books, and in some dictionaries, for *berth*, a room or sleeping-place in a ship.

But where only one mode obtains, I hold it to be unpardonable to depart from it. Under this last head, I complain that my orthography has been sadly misrepresented to the public eye on sundry occasions and in divers excellent periodicals.

Thus, in defiance of rule and usage and Johnson and Walker and Webster and my own most trustworthy manuscript, I have been made to say in print, *decypher* instead of decipher—*indivisable* instead of indivisible—*etherial* for ethereal—*indispensible* for indispensable—*outporing* for outpouring—*incontestible* for incontestable—*maintainance* for maintenance—*untill* for until—*bigotted* for bigoted—*defered* for deferred—*preventative* for preven-

tive—*cotemporary* for contemporary—*L. L. D.* for LL.D.—*feign* for fain—*accepted* for excepted—*wrapt* for rapt—*statute* for statue—*principle* for principal—*affect* for effect—*cannon* for canon—*ingenius* for ingenuous—*diverse* for divers—*aye* for ay—*practice* for practise: and *vice versa* in reference to several of the last mentioned.

In one of my recent felicitous inspirations, I found *intuitively* substituted for *instinctively*—and *vanished* for *evanished*. I was doubtful whether the first was an editorial correction, or a *compositorial* blunder, or whether it was to be debited to my unreadable hieroglyphics. The last, I suspect, must have arisen from a malicious combination among the *corps* to exclude it altogether from their columns—because the said *evanish* had been, in like manner, cashiered twice before. Now the precise distinction between *evanish* and *vanish* cannot be told—it must be felt. It is as great, however, as between champagne and small beer.

A late number of the National Banner contained some very judicious and orthodox remarks on orthography; and had the editor reached the whole of my case, I should have withheld this imperfect account of my typographical calamities. I was glad to see *depository* and *depositary*, *guarantee* and *guaranty*, *impassable* and *impassible*, etc. among his specifications—as they are very generally confounded and misused.

Will you have the goodness, Mr. Editor, to give some worthy gentlemen a hint about such current vulgarisms as—*I done it* for *I did it*—*I had went* or *underwent* for *I had gone* or *undergone*—*I plead* for *I pleaded*—*he arriv*

for *he arrived*—the company *detained* for *remained*—*he lays in bed* for *he lies in bed*—*he sets* at table for *he sits*—and a score or two more—besides Americanisms and provincialisms innumerable?

F. G. F.

P. S.—I do not adopt the peculiar orthography or orthoepy of Dr. Webster, except in a few obvious cases. His vocabulary and definitions are invaluable. He has, however, sanctioned the use of some unnecessary and inelegant neologisms—as to *progress*, *lengthy*, etc. Modern English authority, it is true, may be cited for these and similar innovations. But no additions or changes ought to be tolerated, which do not manifestly improve or enrich the language.

HORRID ROBBERY AND MURDER.*

[JANUARY, 1832.]

I HAVE read many a tale of wo, and wept over a thousand and one *horrifying* accounts of mortal man's dreadful deeds of darkness and barbarity—but never—no never—have I met with anything parallel to the circumstantial and deliberate villany which has been recently perpetrated in the midst of this enlightened, hospitable, virtuous and benevolent community. Indeed, I cannot find, within the vast compass of my truly opulent and exhaustless vocabulary, words of adequate potency to portray the frightful features of the iniquitous, cruel and monstrous outrage which it has become my melancholy duty to record. I shudder and quake in every limb and throughout my entire corporeal establishment, at the bare thought of essaying the dismal development of such unheard of wrongs. But murder will out—and if I do not expose the whole nefarious transaction, it will find a tongue and speak for itself.

In order to conduct the courteous reader kindly and gently to the pith and marrow—to the very raw-

* Printed in the *Nashville Herald*, January, 1832.

head and bloody-bones—of my most awful tragedy—I will calmly premise a few simple truisms by way of preparation. I do not wish to alarm or to distress him prematurely, or to agitate his nervous system too intensely at the threshold. He will require all his native fortitude and all the accumulated stores of philosophy and experience, to enable him to maintain his intellectual balance, when fairly ushered into the full presence of majestic truth and eloquent fact.

TIME then is money—it is an estate—it is honour—it is science—it is history—it is poetry—it is eloquence—it is empire—it is fame—it is life—it is immortality. Rob a man of his time, and what do you leave him? Had Homer or Demosthenes or Tully or Cæsar or Milton or Washington been cheated out of ten, twenty or thirty years of their *time*—what would they have been? Or where would now be the proud memorials of their existence? Time to them, as it is to all men, was everything. Happily for their fair fame, some modern time-killing contrivances were then unknown. Now here is *multum in parvo* for sage cogitation and grave calculation. I suggest these brief hints *in limine*, and leave them to be followed out in all their bearings and applications, as the exordium and the key to the deplorable case which is the present matter of lamentation and complaint.

I have been cozened, defrauded, bamboozled and swindled out of more precious time, by all sorts of honest men and rogues, than would have sufficed a master genius, like myself, to compose the Iliad or Paradise

Lost, or to have liberated the Poles or conquered China. I will specify but one mode, among the many, by which this irreparable mischief has been inflicted. I belong to sundry companies, clubs, corporations, societies, boards and institutions—the members of which are required to meet for the gratuitous transaction of business at certain places and at stated hours. Of course, I am always punctually at my post—but there I must wait, and wait, and wait in vain, for a quorum. Another meeting must be called in consequence—and, for the like failure, another,—and perhaps another. Thus am I compelled to go four times, and to waste two or three hours each time, in order to do the business of half an hour! And when a *quorum* do get together, it is usually at least an hour after the time appointed—and this again I must lose. From this one cause I have lost, on an average, three hours a week, for the last seven years—which is 156 hours a year, or 1092 hours in seven years—which, at twelve working hours a day, amounts to 91 days. If to this one item be added all other similar losses occasioned by the want of punctuality in others in regard to the every day concerns of life—the sum total could not be less than one year in seven! So much of my life has been nullified—destroyed—annihilated.

I have been robbed of all the money which I might have earned in that time—of all the knowledge which I might have acquired—of all the great and good and wonderful things which I might have achieved in that time. In a word, my life has been thus much curtailed.

I have been murdered by inches, and am still being murdered—I am stretched upon the rack—am burning at the stake—starving in a dungeon—and thus have been for years and years and years—so that I have scarcely found leisure for anything more than a sorry newspaper paragraph—for which I always get more kicks than coppers.

F. G. F.

A PRODIGIOUS PREDICTION.*

HAPPENING the other day to step into Decker and Dyer's to look at the papers and pick up the news, and drink a glass of—I mean Adam's ale—I am a temperance man—my attention was presently arrested by the conversation of two or three of our most eminent sages upon the *tariff*. As I sat by the fire (it was the snowy Tuesday) warming my toes and musing over the last telegraph, (I am staunch for Jackson, and go the whole quadruped, as Major Noah has it,) I heard sundry grave tirades and pathetic lamentations against and concerning this same most judicious and truly American tariff. As usual, my unlucky tongue soon got the better of my discretion, and began, without due reverence for my masters, to utter an off-hand lecture upon political economy. *Political economy*, by-the-way, is my hobby—and I intend to enlighten or rather to astonish the natives on this theme, at the lyceum, some time or other. But let that pass.

“Sir,” said I, addressing the last speaker, “I have bestowed a good deal of attention upon this subject”—this I premised *modestly*, and as an apology for my apparent presumption—“and I venture to *predict* that, before ten years, the cotton planters will be more clam-

* Printed in the *Nashville Herald*, December 15, 1831.

orous for a tariff to protect their staple commodity than the Yankees themselves now are"—and I urged some ponderous reasons why and wherefore.

"Faith, (replied my hero,) and I have studied the subject too, and know all about it, and you are a block-head, and therefore may as well hang up your whistle." This was a knock-me-down syllogism. And so I was silenced, dumbfounded, and put *hors de combat*, in a trice, as I deserved. After gathering up my scattered brains as well as I could, I sat quietly as a listener again—a docile learner, as befitted me, at the feet of these accomplished Gamaliels. Having been, for some twenty years past, a diligent, though somewhat plodding (modesty again) student in the school of Smith, Malthus, Ricardo and Say, I tried to console myself for the untoward logical drubbing by soberly realizing the extraordinary privilege of being thus casually within hearing of the living and present oracles of their most curious and not very comprehensible science. I was therefore all ear—after the gentle hint above recited—which, by-the-way, was pretty much such a hint as Paddy got when he was kicked down stairs.

As I had no note-book at hand to keep a running record of the pithy sentences and orthodox *dicta* which were put forth on the occasion, and as my memory, which is but treacherous, at best, was not a little *discomfuzzled* at that particular conjuncture, I may be unable to do justice to the learned gentleman as a reporter, and must therefore move onward or back out, as best I can, in my own muddy fashion.

Among other *memorabilia*, foreign commerce was lauded sky high, as the principal source of national and individual wealth. *Inter alia*, Poland was instanced to prove that domestic industry, (meaning domestic manufactures,) without an extended foreign commerce, can never enrich, but must necessarily impoverish a country. Now I (egotism is abominable) had always opined that Poland was pretty tolerably poor, because she was merely an agricultural, and not a manufacturing country. And that the very means of insuring wealth to the Poles (after giving them liberty) would be to introduce the mechanical arts among them, and to induce them to manufacture *at home* the raw material with which their fine territory abounds, instead of depending on distant nations for most of the comforts and luxuries of life—and for which they have nothing to give in exchange but wheat:—an article too cheap and abundant to be worth growing for a foreign market. Fifty bushels of wheat would not procure a Warsovian *exquisite* a fashionable coat from London or Paris.

I have learned (learning is a humbug) from history and geography and political economy (ah, me *miserum!*) and a little travelling about in the world (I have been to Boston) with my eyes wide open, that a purely agricultural people are always comparatively poor—except (*exceptio probat regulam*) when and where they happen to monopolize particular agricultural products, as was once the case with tobacco (see King James' Counterblast) in Virginia—and as is the case, to some extent, with rice, cotton, sugar and coffee in the West Indies and in our

Southern States. This too is the sole reason why slaves are profitable in such countries. Destroy the monopoly, and slavery cannot exist. The system would be too expensive. Could cotton, rice, sugar and coffee be now grown in Great Britain, France and New England, as well as in Jamaica, Georgia and Louisiana, not a slave would be worth the keeping five years hence. Again, were Ohio, Pennsylvania and New York to enjoy a monopoly of wheat, so that the rest of the Union and half of Europe should be dependent on those States for their bread, then slaves would be more profitable there than they now are in any part of the world

Now, cotton may be grown over half the surface of our globe, and in Peru besides—and when it shall be cultivated by *freemen* (*ecce signum*, in Liberia) anywhere extensively, so as to compete in the market with our Southern cotton, I *guess* we shall soon be as poor as Poland, notwithstanding our foreign commerce—unless we shall, in the mean time, discover some other agricultural rarity of general demand, and peculiar to our own region, or unless we become manufacturers for ourselves.

That the ill-starred tariff has a tendency to hasten the crisis—that is, to stimulate the growth of cotton in other countries, may be true enough. But then, the mischief is done. The malign influence is abroad. The impulse has been given, and it is felt. The dreadful work has commenced. A repeal of the tariff tomorrow would neither arrest nor retard the mighty revolution which is going forward in this respect. All we can now hope for, is the continued monopoly of the

home market—the protection, namely, of our cotton against foreign competition at the very doors of our own manufacturers.

The Yankees are shrewd fellows. They have learned how to manufacture cotton cloths cheaply and cleverly: and they are now *spering* about every nook and corner of our little planet, and perhaps of the moon to boot, to see where they can get the raw material at less price than our negroes furnish it. Then, “down with the tariff,” will be the Yankee cry:—and what will the Southernns respond?

But here I must stop to breathe a moment—though but just fairly landed in *medias res*.

F. G. F.

REMINISCENCES

OF

REV. SAMUEL STANHOPE SMITH, D.D., LL.D.

A LETTER TO REV. DR. WM. B. SPRAGUE.*

NASHVILLE, February 2, 1848.

MY DEAR SIR:—

YOU request me to communicate my impressions of the character of the late President Smith. I suppose you do not expect me to write an obituary notice or biographical sketch of this eminent person, nor yet a review of his several publications. What you ask for, if I mistake not, is my own individual estimate of the man, as spontaneously formed during the period of my personal intercourse with him. This, too, notwithstanding the elaborate "Memoir of his Life and Writings" prefixed to an edition of his posthumous sermons, which appeared in 1821, and which has probably left little or nothing to be told. Rather, therefore, in compliance with the wishes of a friend, than with a hope of furnishing any additional matter of interest or moment, I am willing to make the attempt to revive and record some desultory reminiscences of my venerated instructor.

When I first became acquainted with Dr. Smith, he

* Republished, by permission, from the *Annals of the American Pulpit*, for which it was originally prepared.

had already attained the summit of his well-earned celebrity. Throughout the Middle and Southern States, he was regarded as the most eloquent and learned divine among his contemporaries. His reputation as a popular preacher had been long before established in Virginia, where *Samuel Davies* was still remembered by multitudes of his hearers, and while *Patrick Henry* was yet in the zenith of his brilliant career. There too he had founded a flourishing college; and to his sole agency and influence Hampden Sidney owed its origin and early prosperity. In the midst of his successful labours, as its principal, and as the pastor of a church in its vicinity, he had been invited by his *Alma Mater* to return to the scene of his youthful studies, and his first essays as a tutor. He had accepted the invitation, and for years, first as professor, and afterwards as president, had contributed to elevate the college to a position of the highest usefulness and respectability.

It was in these auspicious circumstances,—just after the desolations occasioned by the fire in 1802 had been repaired,—that I began to attend his instructions, and to know him as the president. The opinion of college lads about men and institutions may be of little value in the great world; and yet it is oftentimes but the echo of the public voice, or a somewhat exaggerated expression of the popular judgment. They are apt to think and speak of their teachers as they hear others speak of them. From our childhood, we (the students) had never heard the Doctor's name pronounced but with praise. We came to the college, therefore, prepared to look up

to him as the great man of the age. His superior talents and accomplishments, as a preacher, scholar, philosopher and writer were everywhere spoken of and acknowledged. And we never doubted that he possessed all the attributes and graces which could dignify and adorn the high station which he filled. Such were our prepossessions in his favour at the outset. And there was no subsequent reaction. He daily grew in our esteem. We thought not only that he was equal to every emergency, but that no other man could have succeeded so well. He seemed always to say and to do everything in the happiest manner. In his various college performances, in the chapel, and in the recitation room, however brief or unpremeditated, or by whatever occasion suggested,—as well as in the more ornate and studied exercises of the pulpit,—he satisfied every expectation. It seemed natural for him “to put proper words in proper places,” and to select the most expressive. There was no affectation or mannerism, or artifice, or formality, about him. He was simple and unostentatious, and apparently regardless or forgetful of himself. We admired his personal appearance and deportment. And we always listened to his speech with pleasure if not with profit. We never questioned his sincerity and uprightness. We revered him as a faithful Christian minister,—far above reproach or suspicion.

He was less obnoxious, probably than most other men in the like office, to the witticisms, and ridicule, and swaggery, of the disorderly and mischievous portion of the students. That these should not have been always

particularly gratified with his discipline, might be presumed. But I never witnessed any attempt to excite a laugh at his expense, or to play off a trick upon him in any fashion, or to exhibit him in a ludicrous attitude, or to caricature any of his remarks or actions. He never betrayed any foibles, or defects, or peculiarities, which could serve the purpose either of fun or abuse. He was the well-bred, courteous gentleman, everywhere, at all times, in all companies, on all occasions. The dignity of his bearing, though not repulsive or oppressive, was uniform and imposing. His very presence would rebuke, overawe, and silence the most turbulent assemblage of youth that ever met for sport or riot,—during my time at least.

Instead of reading his written Lectures on Moral Philosophy, and the Evidences of Christianity, they were previously placed in the hands of the students, and carefully studied in manuscript as text-books. Each member of the Senior class possessed a copy,—transcribed by himself or some person whom he employed to do it, or purchased from a predecessor. Questions were asked upon the subject-matter of the lecture, accompanied or followed by pertinent illustrations and explanations. I have already said enough to show how we appreciated these familiar instructions.

Of the government of the college at this period of its greatest prosperity, under President Smith, I can hardly use language too favourable. It was maintained in rigid accordance with the spirit and letter of the printed code of laws, which every student at his matriculation, prom-

ised to obey. I do not mean that there occurred no violations of law, or that every transgressor was duly punished. Such perfection has never been attained in any school or community, or under any system of government or administration. It is enough to say that we all fully believed that if we neglected our duties, or committed any offence, we should certainly be dealt with according to our deserts; and that all reasonable vigilance was exerted, both to prevent and detect every species of delinquency or disorder. We regarded the Doctor as a firm, resolute, fearless, and decided man,—who would not wink at crime or folly,—but who, nevertheless, cherished towards us the most kindly and paternal feelings. My present deliberate opinion is, that he was one of the ablest and most successful disciplinarians of any age. I speak of him as he was in his best days; and these alone ought to testify as to his capacity and conduct.

Some time after graduation, I returned to Princeton, when as a tutor in the college, and student of theology, (from 1807 to 1810,) I became more intimately acquainted with Dr. Smith: and again, from his resignation in 1812 to his decease in 1819, my intercourse with him continued without interruption. Dr. Smith officiated as Professor of Theology, during the whole period of his presidency, with the exception of two or three years, (from 1803 to 1806,) when that chair was occupied by the Rev. Henry Kollock, D.D. The “Divinity Class” consisted, in my time, of some eight or ten young men, including the College Tutors,—to

whose instruction he devoted two evenings of the week. He generally read a portion of his Lectures or notes as he called them, and then dilated upon the topics, in a free colloquial style, and always much to our edification. He directed our course of reading, heard our essays, and suggested subjects for investigation, dissertation, or oral disputation. The course included systematic Theology, ecclesiastical history and polity, pastoral duties, the Bible, and a large range in the fields of classic and general literature. He also attended and presided over an association, composed of the above and other resident graduates, who used to meet once a week for mutual improvement. This was a kind of philosophical as well as debating society. Here too, the learned President in exhibiting the *pro* and *con* of controversy, in disentangling a knotty question, in distinguishing the real and practical from the cloudy and incomprehensible, in exposing error and sophistry, in sustaining truth and sound logic, or in "summing up,"—was the "great master,"—and the liberal umpire in all our wordy battles.

It will be seen from what has been said, that he must have been a working man. The stated preacher and pastor, the indefatigable teacher, (of sciences, too, usually distributed among several Professors,) the author of his own text-books and of not a few others, the responsible Head and Governor of a College, which he had twice re-edified, the regular attendant and a most efficient member of the judicatories of the Church which he loved,—and more frequently invited or constrained to the performance of special and honourable

services than any of his contemporaries,—verily he seldom could have laid aside his “harness” or known the comfort of repose.

Of his published works, though numerous and diversified, I shall take no further notice than to add the remark that few men, in any situation, have written so much and so well. These, however, do not fairly portray the man. Of their literary merit the critical reader will judge for himself. His philosophy and biblical exegesis, in some particulars, may be questioned or disallowed; but all will concede to him candour, honesty, habitual reverence for truth and righteousness, and great ability in the exposition and defense of his theories. He was a diligent, persevering student through life. He knew how to employ usefully every leisure moment with pen or book. He was conversant with the literature, science, philosophy, and politics, of ancient and modern times. He was a classical scholar in the highest and best acceptation of the phrase. He was master, not merely of the mechanism and grammar of the Greek and Latin languages, but was deeply imbued with the spirit of the great authors. His delicate and cultivated taste enabled him to discriminate and to relish the finest and most exquisitely wrought passages, as well as the more obvious beauties and sublimities, of the poet and the orator. He wrote and conversed in Latin with great facility, and was a first rate prosodist. In these accomplishments I have rarely met his equal.

He was not a recluse. His varied duties, public and professional, required him to be much abroad in the

world, and to mingle with all sorts and classes of people. His house was frequented by the good, the great, the wise, the intelligent; and humble merit was always welcome at his board and fireside. He was not ambitious, except in the apostolic sense. Instead of any leaning to covetousness, the tendency of his benevolent nature was rather to the opposite extreme. He was free from envy, and jealousy, and resentment. Of these I could never detect in him the slightest indication. He had enemies, and he knew them. He was often misrepresented, and sometimes grossly slandered. But he uttered no words of complaint, or anger, or unkindness. I believe he forgave them and prayed for them. He was an Israelite indeed, in whom was no guile. He appeared incapable of deception, or intrigue, or crafty management, for any purpose. He was no bigot or dogmatist. He cheerfully conceded to others the same liberty, with all the rights of conscience and judgment, which he claimed for himself. He would defend his own creed or opinions without arrogance or bitterness. He could demolish error or heresy, without abusing or denouncing men, or sects, or parties.

In the General Assembly, Synod, and Presbytery, of his Church, he was confessedly *primus inter pares*,—or at least second to none,—if report and tradition may be credited. But as my observation did not extend to these, I shall attempt no description. There was a wide difference in the character of his eloquence, between his early and later years. I happened, while on a visit to

Virginia in 1810, to meet with several elderly persons who had heard him preach, when a young man. They spoke of him as an impassioned orator,—like Whitefield or their own Davies and Henry. They spoke, too, of his patriotic speeches at the beginning of the Revolution, and of their marvellous effect upon the people. Now I never witnessed anything of this sort. He had long before my day been disabled for such efforts. In the pulpit, when I heard him, he was comparatively calm and subdued in manner,—though the most dignified, graceful and impressive of preachers.

At the age of sixty-two, he was compelled, by ill health, to relinquish all public employments. During the remaining seven years he lived in retirement. This was perhaps the most beautiful and instructive period of his life. It often looms up before me like a bright, blessed, glorious vision,—such as we dream of, but never realize. It seemed as though all the Christian graces and virtues, freed from every human imperfection, had now clustered around him, and blended together, like the colors of the rainbow, into a living form of chastened, hallowed, radiant loveliness.

His person, presence, and carriage were so remarkable that he never entered the village church or college chapel, or walked the streets, or appeared in any company, without arresting attention, or creating a sensation, not of surprise or wonder, but of pleasing, grateful admiration,—a kind of involuntary emotion and homage of the heart—a tribute as cordially yielded

as it was richly deserved. In a word, the venerable figure, the saintly aspect, the benignant smile, the ethereal spirit, the tranquil resignation, the humble faith, the cheerful temper, the habitual meekness, the generous sympathy, the comprehensive charity, the modest unpretending gentleness of his whole manner,—all proclaimed the mature and gifted Christian, ready to depart, and calmly expecting his final translation to a more congenial world.

To the last, this good man continued accessible and attractive to all; and he well knew how to engage in pleasant and profitable conversation with persons of every variety of age, rank, and condition. Always the Christian gentleman, it was impossible for him to make an approach towards levity or coarseness, in word or act. I never heard from his lips an anecdote or allusion, a hint or expression, which might not have been whispered in seraph's ears. This innate purity or acquired sense of propriety, I think, was peculiar and characteristic. It certainly is not always prominent even among divines. He took great interest in the youthful candidates for the ministry. He delighted much in their society. His little parlour was often filled with them. And then, what words of wisdom, of kindness, of encouragement, of counsel,—and the prayer!—for he always concluded these meetings with prayer. The prayer of the dying patriarch,—of the ascending prophet!—for such to us he seemed. Thus blandly and peacefully passed away the latter years of the veteran invalid

soldier of the cross,—doing what he could,—still, as ever, faithful to his vows, and zealous in his Master's service. If he had faults, I saw them not; or if I did, I have long since forgotten them. Such are my recollections of Dr. Smith.

Very respectfully and truly yours,

PHILIP LINDSLEY.

THOUGHTS ON SLAVERY.

AN EXTRACT.

[THE following passage is the one to which reference is made on page 574 of the present volume, as containing the author's earlier views on American Slavery. It formed a part of his discourse from Gal. i. 10, on leaving Princeton in 1824, and was published at the time in pamphlet form at the request of the Senior Class of the College of New Jersey, accompanied by an Appendix, explaining more fully his position. As, however, the whole passage was omitted in the author's carefully revised manuscript copy of the discourse, written long afterward at New Albany, it was thought best, in republishing the discourse in the second volume of his Works, to follow the manuscript rather than the printed copy. Hence the sermon now appears without the passage. But, inasmuch as the passage is a remarkable one, as showing the author's views at that early period, and inasmuch as he had himself once committed it to the press, it has been thought every way appropriate to insert it, along with the explanatory Appendix, as a separate article, in this volume of his political and miscellaneous writings.]

Men often overlook the claims to their generosity which are at hand—near at home—at their very doors—while they make a show of extraordinary sympathy and regard for remote objects, about which the public mind may happen to be greatly excited. They will give, for instance, to the rescue of the Greeks from Turkish oppression, while they forget that we retain in this land of liberty a people as numerous as the Greeks, in a state of bondage, a hundred-fold more degrading and miserable than any Mohammedan tyrant

ever dreamt of inflicting on his conquered vassals. I object not to our aiding the Greeks in their noble struggle for independence and the rights of man. Theirs is a good cause, and worthy of more substantial support than all our eloquent speeches have yet procured for it.

But when will Christian charity awake to the tears and groans and cries and sufferings of the two millions of wretched Africans, who were dragged from their distant homes by Christian avarice,—not subdued in the field of battle, and subjected to the usual fate of a conquered people, as were the Greeks,—and who are here doomed, under Christian masters, to drink the bitterest cup ever presented to the lips of humanity? The very tenderest mercies which they experience at our hands, are cruelty and mockery, compared with the harshest treatment which the Mussulman has ever shown to a Christian subject in time of peace. And even in the tumult and fury of rebellion, have the infidel Turks been more prompt to destroy and to exterminate, than are Christians in seasons of insurrection among their Christian slaves? How absurd is it for us to volunteer as knights-errant in the cause of liberty, humanity, and religion, while the fairest portions of our land are cursed and blasted with ignorance and depravity and slavery and cruelty, to which the old world has never furnished a parallel!

Colonization Societies may do great good both to individuals here, and to Africa and to Hayti. They may do infinite good, especially to injured Africa. They may withdraw from us many turbulent, ambitious spirits,—

many lazy, worthless vagabonds,—many who here would be burdensome or dangerous to the community, but who may, in a more congenial abode, prove a blessing and an honour to their species. Nay, it is possible that in time they may succeed in conveying the whole black population of these Northern States to the land of their fathers or of their brethren. Heaven prosper them, therefore, and dispose every well-wisher to his country to countenance and to aid them! But they will never touch the tremendous evil which exists,—which is every day rapidly augmenting,—and which is already so threatening and appalling in its aspect that few dare to look it in the face.

Our slaves must be emancipated upon the soil which they cultivate. There is no alternative. And here they will be emancipated, either by the fears, the interest, or the Christian kindness of their oppressors; or, they will, by violence, wrest the rod from the tyrant's grasp, and drench in the white man's blood that soil which has so long been watered by their tears. Two millions of human beings cannot be removed. They cannot be kept in perpetual bondage. In twenty years they will be four millions,—in forty or fifty years, eight millions,—and so concentrated in particular sections of our country that one daring effort will break their chains forever.

Give them Christian instruction,—give them the Bible, you will say. Good,—give them the Bible, and teach them to read it. Christians cannot do less. What a horrible state is that which renders the distribution

of the Bible hazardous to the peace and welfare of any community! But so it is. Give the negroes the Bible, and you virtually charter their freedom. When did the Bible ever circulate freely and generally among a people without inspiring them with a love of liberty, and eventually ensuring them liberty? The connection of civil liberty with religious knowledge is so obvious that it has long been a hackneyed topic of declamation, in reference to every other people except the African slaves. To them, indeed, many affect to imagine that the Bible may be sent to render them more contented with their lot, to enable them to endure the driver's lash, to be insensible to the pang of separation from a husband, a wife, a parent, or a child, at the bidding of avarice or caprice; and to hug their chains in passive submission. As if they were by nature either better than all other men, or so far inferior to all others as to be incapable of feeling or appreciating the motives by which they are actuated.

Here then is a dilemma, rather awkward, indeed, for an American philanthropist to look at. We must either keep the negroes in profound ignorance of the Bible, or, by bestowing it on them, we must contemplate their eventual emancipation.

Partial experiment—particular cases—prove nothing. A few individuals, here and there, may, by religious instruction, become the better servants, and, if really pious, live happily in bondage. But let the Bible shed its light upon, and unfold its treasures to the whole coloured population, and an impulse shall be given

to the mighty mass which no earthly power can resist or control. Twenty white men might live very obedient to their masters' pleasure in Algiers; but twenty thousand, however Christian they might be, would not hesitate to regain their liberty at the hazard of destroying the whole city, and of burying in its ruins the entire population. Such, whether right or wrong, is human nature. If the Bible be expected to achieve such miracles of passive obedience and non-resistance, why not send it to the Greeks, to teach them the grace of patience and submission, instead of furnishing them with money and arms to spread death and desolation around them? With what dignity and truth might not the Turkish despot retort upon Christian freemen their inconsistency and contradictions!

Our Christian ancestors, with the Bible in every man's hands, and confessedly the most pious race on the globe, resisted even to blood, the very first encroachment on their political rights, and to secure them, involved their country in all the horrors of a civil war. And who has ever blamed them for thus withstanding, and for ultimately establishing the perfect independence of their country? Let us beware then of the kind of logic which we apply to men of like passions with ourselves. Assuredly, the day of retribution is at hand. It will be a terrible day; unless, by the seasonable intervention of our charities, we avert it.

Here is scope enough for all the charitable wisdom and enterprise of all our statesmen, philanthropists, scholars, ministers, and Christians. When shall the

united energies of American charity and patriotism be brought to bear upon it with efficiency and success?

The slaves, I repeat, must be free, and will be free upon the soil which they now inhabit. I have not hazarded the assertion lightly, nor without having in mind a plan for the purpose:—but this is not the occasion for its development. My remarks on this fearful subject have been this day pronounced in a corner,—where, if they do no good, they can do no harm. I should not have spoken thus in a slave-holding State. Prudence, benevolence, would have forbid it. When I shall have pitched my tent among the wretched sufferers beyond the mountains, I shall humbly look to Heaven for direction as to the line of conduct which duty may require me to pursue.

I have wandered from my subject,—perhaps from my province,—but I have wandered purposely.

As the author, in the preceding Discourse, has taken occasion to animadvert, with considerable freedom, upon the subject of slavery, he begs leave to say, that, at the time, he had not the most distant idea of publishing his remarks; and when, upon solicitation, he consented to the printing of the Discourse, he did not anticipate its circulation much beyond the limits of the village in which it was delivered. Since, however, it is possible a copy or two may find their way to some sections of our country where the author would regret that his sen-

timents or feelings should be misapprehended, or misrepresented, he further adds, that he had no intention to censure any particular portion of his fellow-citizens more than another. Modern slavery, with all its evils and horrors, is the sin of Christendom. As it exists among us, it originated under the British Government. It is an evil which we have inherited. It is acknowledged to be an evil, and lamented as such, by all our citizens. In some places it is felt to a much greater extent than in others. In several of the British colonies, it has assumed an aspect the most horrific and portentous. And it was, probably, rather from its character, as there presented, that the author received his impressions, than from what has yet occurred among ourselves. Still, the injustice, and the danger, and the demoralizing influence of slavery exist, in awful prominence, in this land of liberty and Christianity. Who will deny it? Nor are the author's anticipations in regard to the future at all singular; or more fearful than have been often expressed by far abler judges. Mr. Jefferson, in a letter to Governor Coles, written ten years ago, predicts a catastrophe as tragical, at least, as Mr. Wilberforce himself would have cared to hazard. "Yet (says Mr. J.) the hour of emancipation is advancing in the march of time. It will come; and whether brought on by the generous energy of our own minds, or by the bloody process of St. Domingo, excited and conducted by the power of our present enemy, if once stationed permanently within our country, offering asylum and arms to the oppressed, is a leaf of our history not yet turned over."

That our slaves will be free at some not very distant day, seems to be taken for granted by every body. The grand question is, *how* shall the work of emancipation be accomplished? *When* shall it be commenced? That the negroes can ever be transported across the ocean, is an idea too chimerical to be seriously entertained by any man. The probability is, that an increase rather than a diminution of their numbers will be the consequence of the benevolent but tardy efforts of our Colonization Societies. When did any country lose in numbers by sending colonies abroad? From Europe the whole continent of America has been lately peopled, and yet Europe has been steadily increasing in population. But space is not here allowed for the argument.

In asserting that the slaves must be free in the land where they now live, their future amalgamation with the whites was not contemplated as desirable, or even possible. Nor is it necessary that they should reside together in the same State or community any longer than it shall be found mutually agreeable and beneficial. Territory may be assigned them for their exclusive habitation whenever they shall be capable of managing their own concerns.

No rash or sudden emancipation would be just, or wise, or politic, or humane. It would be Quixotism and madness to think of giving liberty to the whole mass at once, without any previous training or discipline. What plan could be devised and carried into effect for such a safe and gradual emancipation, as would be consistent with the acquired rights of their holders, and prove a

common blessing to all parties, still remains the great desideratum. Nor does the author mean, at present, to attempt to supply it by any speculations of his own upon the subject. Hundreds of writers might be referred to for opinions and information, as well as many important facts and successful experiments. Among the latter, the attention of the benevolent reader is particularly directed to the noble example recently set us by the Republic of Colombia; and to the system adopted by the late venerable Joshua Steele, for the improvement and eventual emancipation of the slaves on his own estates in Barbadoes.

It is believed that no insuperable difficulty will lie in the way whenever men shall be disposed to engage heartily in this good work. “The love of justice and the love of country (says Mr. Jefferson) plead equally the cause of these people; and it is a mortal reproach to us that they should have pleaded it so long in vain, and should have produced not a single effort; nay, I fear, not much serious willingness to relieve them and ourselves from our present condition of moral and political reprobation.”

If it be our fixed purpose to keep them in bondage as long as possible, then do we act consistently and warily in withholding from them all manner of instruction. Enlightened men can never be retained in servitude except by a power so decidedly superior that resistance would be folly. Let knowledge be diffused throughout any community, and a speedy end will be put to all despotism, tyranny, and oppression. Any

system of education, therefore, designed for the blacks, which comprehends even the simple art of reading, ought to look forward to their seasonable emancipation, and be preparatory to it. Otherwise we shall nurture in our own bosom an enemy who will eagerly seize the first opportunity to repay with a vengeance all our well-intended kindness. Let the light of science and of the Bible shine upon the slave, wherever he is to be found in large numbers, and he will rend in sunder the strongest fetters, and assume that attitude which the conscious dignity of his nature claims as his inherent indefeasible right.

INDEX.

COMPLETE INDEX

TO

THE THREE VOLUMES.

A

- ABEL, being a shepherd, could not have been a savage, iii. 99.
- ABIMELECH, a borrower from the sacred treasury, iii. 343.
- Abolition*, of existing institutions, all the rage, i. 398.
- Abolitionists*, Quixotic objects of, i. 509; rights and duties of, 510; equally at fault with pro-slavery men, iii. 579, 581; both agree on disunion, 568; originated at the South, 570; false philanthropy of, 667, 670.
- Aborigines*, of America, had lost the knowledge of the arts, iii. 118; various opinions on, 153; must have been a primitive people, 155; separation from other races the cause of their degeneracy, 155; striking resemblance among, 165; not all descendants of Ham, 165; their deplorable destiny, 165; occupied this continent after the dispersion at Babel, 186.
- Aborigines*, of Greece and Italy, a savage people, iii. 120.
- ABRAHAM, his trial in the case of Isaac, ii. 683; his conduct vindicated and explained, 684.
- ABSALOM, his democratic blandishments, iii. 343.
- Abstinence*, total, the only remedy for intemperance, iii. 510; main principle of the temperance cause, 529; effective cure for drunkenness, 531.
- Absurdity of banking*, exhibited in the Indiana system, iii. 585, 586.
- Abused mercies*, bring down the curse of Heaven, ii. 613.
- Abuses*, often exhibited in the pulpit, ii. 326.
- Academical study*, its great end, ii. 242.
- Academies and schools*, less costly than prisons, i. 502.
- Accidency*, in the presidential chair, iii. 348.
- Accountability to God*, the nature of, ii. 619.
- ACHAN, the type of uncharitableness in the church, ii. 371.
- Achievements*, of the Americans, i. 581.
- Acts*, external, cannot secure the Divine favour, iii. 482, 483.
- ADAIR and BOUDINOT, on the American Indians, iii. 185.
- ADAM, a teacher, trained in the university of Heaven, i. 505; head and father of his race, ii. 426; representative character of, 500; temporal and eternal consequences of his fall, 604; the cause of all human depravity, 687; endowed with speech at his creation, iii. 95; not a savage, but a naturalist or zoologist, 98; his first sons, one a farmer, the other a shepherd, 98; his apostasy did not reduce man to a savage state, 103; effects of his fall on the pursuits and professions of men, 267; the first farmer and schoolmaster, 267; a mechanic and gardener, 265.
- ADAMS, JOHN, his administration, iii. 342, 343.
- Addresses*, public, of Dr. Lindsley, i. 31; inaugural address at Nashville, i. 65, iii. 27; baccalaureate of 1826, i. 121; baccalaureate of 1827, 173; baccalaureate of 1829, 209; baccalaureate of 1831, 281; baccalaureate of 1832, 331; baccalaureate of 1834, 361; baccalaureate of 1838, 539; address on centennial birthday of Washington, iii. 229; incidents of its delivery, 261; one of his ablest efforts, 262; address to farmers and mechanics, 265; anniversary address at the Bible Society, 459, 479; before the Tennessee State Temperance Society, 505.
- Administration*, of justice, its imperfections, i. 296; of the Lord's Supper, importance of, ii. 536.
- Admission to college*, defective qualifications for, i. 559-561.
- Advice*, to parents, i. 387.
- Advocates*, numerous and learned, of man's original savageism, iii. 88.
- ÆLIAN, quoted on the American aborigines, iii. 167.
- Affairs*, state and national, should be separate, iii. 308.
- Afflictions of life*, their use and end, ii. 457.

- Africa*, once united to America, iii. 159, 161; the slave-mart and slaughter-house of Christendom, 163.
- African slave-trade*, denounced, ii. 310; a disgrace to Christendom, 311; its enormity once tolerated by good men, iii. 523.
- African race*, its advance to civilization in America, iii. 577, 578; amalgamation of, undesirable and impossible, 670.
- African Republic*, of Liberia, counterpart of the United States, iii. 578.
- Africans*, their condition in America, iii. 132, 580, 664.
- Age*, the present, developing a new spirit, ii. 431; what it owes to the art of printing, iii. 116; of Washington the classic era of our history, 258.
- Aged*, avowals of the, ii. 217; best judges of the value of life, iii. 218, 219.
- Agency*, of man, in his regeneration, ii. 515.
- Agents*, speculating, their tricks in banking, iii. 367.
- Agriculture*, favourable to mental culture, i. 124; should be a learned profession, 125; implements of, used by the antediluvians, disprove a savage state, iii. 99; cannot alone make a nation great, 380; to be profitable, must have a market for its products, 381-383.
- Albigenses*, referred to, iii. 430.
- Albinos*, prove nothing as to change of race, iii. 176.
- Alcohol*, poisonous and deleterious nature of, iii. 516.
- ALEXANDER the Great, to be admired and pitied, ii. 170.
- Alexandria*, in Egypt, example of speedy growth, iii. 131.
- ALISON, the historian, referred to, i. 580.
- Alma Mater*, scenes and associations of, pleasant, ii. 228.
- ALMIGHTY GOD, the searcher of hearts, ii. 640.
- Almsgiving*, not a decisive test of charity, ii. 265; does not constitute the whole of religion, 364.
- Alphabetical writing*, perfect in the time of Moses, iii. 101.
- Alumni*, of Nassau Hall, deceased, referred to, ii. 297; of the University of Nashville, number of, in 1834, i. 363; their character not unworthy of their Alma Mater, 391.
- Amalgamation*, influence of, on the varieties of mankind, iii. 176; of black and white races in our country impossible, 670.
- Ambition*, true, its nature and ends, i. 178; worldly, often exhibited by ecclesiasties, ii. 277; its folly and fatal results, 278, 279.
- Amendments*, of the Federal Constitution, always in the power of the people, iii. 319; several, suggested by Dr. Lindsley, 321, 344-349.
- America*, the probable abode of savages soon after the deluge, iii. 153; how first peopled, 154; certainly submerged by the flood, 154; probably referred to by Plato, 156, 157; supposed to be referred to by Moses in the book of Genesis, 160; peopled from Africa by descendants of Ham, 161; her successful example of free government appealed to in other nations, 239; how she ought to treat England on tariff matters, 383; too dependent on England for manufactures, 384; stigmatized as the land of drunkards, 508.
- American Amazons*, an offset to ancient fables, iii. 168.
- American Bible Society*, origin and objects of, iii. 465; its deep interest in our Western country, 466; its noble resolutions in 1829, 499.
- American Churches*, their unhappy divisions, iii. 208.
- American Cities*, their sudden growth, iii. 131.
- American Clergy*, vindication of, as enlightened and faithful, i. 326.
- American Colleges*, might learn something from abroad, i. 99; funds and endowments of various, 216; adapted to the people, 405; well suited for boys from fifteen to twenty-one, 405; their resemblance to German gymnasia, 405.
- American Colonization Society*, objects to be accomplished by, iii. 563; inadequate to remove the whole African race, 668, 670.
- American Common Schools*, three parties on, i. 648.
- American Democracy*, article on, in five parts, iii. 265, 317, 354, 376, 394.
- American Episcopacy*, not inclined to Erastianism, iii. 420.
- American Equality*, a source of wit and satire to the English, iii. 498.
- American Experiment*, the separation of Church and State, iii. 498.
- American Forefathers*, never in bondage, i. 454; their spirit and aims, 586; what they owed to the Bible, iii. 665.
- American Government*, excellence of, as left by our fathers, iii. 329.
- American History*, its classic age that of Washington, iii. 258.
- American Indians*, still as savage as when first discovered, iii. 116; their loss of the useful arts, 119; probably descended from Ham, 128; must be traced to a high antiquity, 155; probably as old as any other variety of the race, 175; supposed to be descendants of the Malays of Southern Asia, 186.

- American Institutions*, the growth of two centuries, iii. 245; founded on the Bible, 529.
- American Liberty*, how it may be lost, iii. 257.
- American Literature*, yet to be created, i. 355; its high and sacred mission, 356.
- American Methodism*, the episcopal character of, iii. 429.
- American Name*, true glory of, i. 352; right of the citizens of the United States to, 580; honoured abroad, 587; compared to that of the old Roman, 588.
- American National University*, the project for, i. 407; every thing that man can know should be taught in, 408.
- American Patriotism*, contrasted with that of Rome, i. 354; its wide field and glorious mission, 355.
- American People*, their great responsibilities, i. 355; radically changed since 1776, 466; defective education of, 467; moral character of, 468.
- American Policy*, administrative, should be uniform, iii. 346; should encourage manufactures, 384.
- American Politician*, what he ought to be, i. 288.
- American Presbyterian Church*, its first theological seminary, ii. 81; should have more missionary zeal, 435.
- American Republic*, has no parallel in history, i. 584, 585.
- American Revolution*, the leaders of, i. 140; the mainspring of all subsequent ones, iii. 239; why the only successful one, 240; a war of principle, 247; the great interests staked on, 247; tremendous responsibility of its leaders and inequality of the contest, 248; favored of heaven, and thus successful, 249; benefits and privileges secured by, 252; not a war against monarchy, 406.
- American Sages*, their views of the need of public education in our country, i. 485.
- American Savages*, their destiny similar to that of all Ham's descendants, iii. 163; apparently doomed to extinction, 164.
- American System*, an experiment for the world, i. 199.
- American Temperance Society*, when founded, iii. 510.
- American Union*, necessity of its preservation, i. 354; possibility of its dissolution, iii. 255.
- American Universities*, inferiority of, compared with those of Europe, i. 404.
- American Youth*, enter college too early, i. 386, mostly spoiled at home, 387.
- Americans*, their fondness for honorary titles contemptible, i. 214; generally acquainted with the Bible, 313; not an ambitious people, 585; honoured every-
where for their country, 587; should study the Farewell Address of Washington, iii. 230; worthy of their English sires, 231; their fathers never the slaves of Great Britain, 311; not always noted for personal independence, 312; governed too much by partisan public opinion, 313; distinguished as spitting animals, 623.
- Amherst College*, funds of, i. 158.
- Amor Patriæ*, a useful prejudice, iii. 193.
- Amusements* for the poor in cities, fraught with vice and folly, iii. 599.
- Analogies*, between nature and revelation, ii. 641; in reasoning, often deceptive and fallacious, iii. 82.
- ANANIAS and SAPPHIRA, sad case of ambition and avarice, iii. 482.
- Anathema*, against churches, repugnant to Presbyterians, iii. 452.
- Ancient Architecture*, not the work of savage nations, iii. 136.
- Ancient Egyptians*, not inferior to modern Europeans, iii. 148.
- Ancient Genius*, monuments of, bear witness to its greatness, iii. 105.
- Ancient Nations*, superiority of, in literature and the arts, ii. 419; inferiority of, in moral science, 420.
- Ancient Philosophy*, held to a primeval savage state, iii. 88.
- Ancient Schools*, compared with modern colleges, i. 91.
- Andover*, theological seminary at, i. 87.
- Anecdote*, on the delivery of Dr. Lindsley's centennial address, iii. 261; temperance, of the Bishop of London, 617.
- Angels*, of the Seven Churches, were pastors or chief presbyters, iii. 409.
- Anglican Church*, purely Erastian in government, iii. 420.
- Anglo-Americans*, their share in the glory of England, iii. 230.
- Anglo-Malthusian Theory*, nonsense to Americans, iii. 381.
- Animals*, created in a state of perfect maturity, iii. 98.
- Annals* of the American Pulpit, article from, on Dr. Smith, iii. 652.
- Annihilation* of money, in the use of strong drink, iii. 523, 524.
- Anniversary Commencements*, of the University of Nashville, i. 375; in the Eastern colleges, 427.
- Annual Consumption* of distilled liquors, enormous, iii. 524.
- Antediluvians*, attainments of, in art and science, i. 67; their high stage of civilization, iii. 100, 112.
- Ante-Revolutionary Annals*, illustrious names in the American, iii. 231.
- Antichrist*, spirit of, in the apostolic times, iii. 405; policy of, in the modern church, ii. 316, 317.

- Antichristian Hierarchy*, origin and growth of, in the Middle Ages, iii. 203.
- Antiquaries*, European, their researches at Babylon, iii. 107; discoveries in Egypt, 147.
- Antiquities of America*, inquiry into, by Delafield, iii. 162.
- Antiquity*, its claims to superiority over modern times, slowly admitted, iii. 105.
- ANTONINUS and PLATO, unable to discover Divine truth, ii. 423.
- Apostasy*, of our first parents, its fearful consequences, ii. 499, iii. 103.
- Apostate Condition*, of man, by nature, ii. 389.
- Apostles of Christ*, their official pre-eminence, iii. 409, 446; had no successors in office, 409, 411; their number, 409; gave no direction about the succession, 411; extent and success of their labours, 520, ii. 611.
- Apostolical Succession*, prelatie claims of, iii. 410; not held by Hooker in the recent Puseyite sense, 412.
- Apostolic Church*, changes of, in the lifetime of the apostles, iii. 428.
- Apostrophe*, to the dead of Nassau Hall, ii. 229.
- Apparatus*, necessary for a university, i. 401.
- Appeal* to Christians at Nashville, in behalf of the Bible cause, iii. 502.
- Arbitrary Power*, not needed in the temperance cause, iii. 529.
- Arch*, not unknown to the Egyptians, as once thought, iii. 184.
- Archæology*, Dr. Lindsley's lectures on, iii. 28.
- Archangel*, fallen, ii. 195.
- ARCHBISHOPS SUMNER and TENISON, their opinions of Presbyterian divines, iii. 411, 412.
- Archbishops*, origin of their titles and powers, iii. 418.
- Archives*, lost, of ancient civilized nations, i. 126.
- Ardent Spirits*, must be proscribed, i. 184; extensive use of, in former days, iii. 508; moderate use of, the cause of intemperance, 510; poisonous nature of, 516; diseases produced by, 518; no protection to the human system, 519; not the grand elixir of life, as once supposed, 519; not to be defended as a beverage on scriptural grounds, 531; not needed by any class of labouring men, 526; held by the Quakers to be an unlawful article of commerce, 539.
- Arguments*, from the infinite, unsafe, ii. 691; from reason, for the primeval civilization of man, iii. 84; from Scripture, against an original savage state, 97, 112; fallacious, on church government, 404, 405; against modern high-church prelacy, 417; ludicrous, on political economy, 649.
- Argumentum ad absurdum*, on religious prejudices, iii. 205.
- Arian and Socinian heresies*, origin of, ii. 695.
- Aristocracy*, domination of, in the Grecian and Roman democracies, iii. 468; indications of, in our country before the Revolution, 252; of virtue and talent, 281; spiritual, in Episcopal church, 429.
- Aristocrats*, upstart, described, iii. 279.
- ARISTOTLE and PLATO, groped in darkness, as to moral truth, ii. 420; influence of their philosophical systems on the gospel, iii. 201.
- Ark*, of Noah, a triumph of architectural skill, iii. 104.
- Armies*, mentioned in Scripture, great size of, iii. 180.
- ARMINIUS, JAMES, writings of, ii. 348; held the doctrine of justification by faith, 348.
- Army*, of the law, need of reform in, i. 294; of Christian heroes and martyrs, ii. 137.
- ARNOLD, BENEDICT, cause of his downfall, i. 201; our country has produced but one, iii. 261.
- Art*, human, monuments of, i. 67; of printing, influence on the progress of man, 71; of reading, its difficulty, 512; of writing, not unknown to the antediluvians, iii. 101; state of, in Noah's time, how ascertained, 103.
- Arts and Sciences*, of the antediluvians, disprove an original savage state, iii. 99.
- Articles*, Dr. Lindsley's, in the American Biblical Repository, iii. 81, 112, 153, 191; many contributed to the Nashville newspapers, 602.
- Articles* on which a tariff should be laid, iii. 378.
- Artifices*, of hypocrites, ii. 272.
- ASCHAM, BACON, LOCKE, and other writers on education, i. 522.
- Asia*, probably once united to America by land, iii. 172.
- Asiatic Civilization*, different from European, iii. 135.
- Asiatic Hamites*, none of them negroes, iii. 164.
- Assassination*, less horrible than the doom of the drunkard, iii. 536.
- Assembly*, of divines, at Westminster, in 1643; its labours, iii. 431, 432.
- Associations*, for mental improvement in England, i. 123; necessary for man, iii. 512; temperance, good achieved by, 527.
- ASTOR, WILLIAM B., referred to, iii. 597.
- Astronomy*, known before the Deluge, iii. 105; true science of, understood at an early date in Egypt, 143.

- Assyrians*, like Egyptians and Phœnicians, known in history only as a civilized people, iii. 125.
- Atheism*, its reign over men at an end, i. 167; too difficult to be believed by the multitude, ii. 440; not proved by the eternity of matter, 694; result of its reign in France, iii. 194.
- Atheists*, a nation of, described, ii. 109.
- Athenians*, their titles of nativity, iii. 121.
- Atlantic Ocean*, origin of the name traced to the lost island of Atlantis in Plato, iii. 156, 157.
- Atonement* for sin, secured in Christ, ii. 605; all-sufficiency of, 692; finished on Calvary, iii. 488.
- Attendance* on the sanctuary, perversions of, ii. 102.
- AUGUSTINE, ST., referred to, ii. 46; held the system of doctrine afterwards held by Calvin, 349.
- Austerity*, in the observance of the Sabbath, condemned, ii. 96.
- Austria*, public-school system of, i. 240, 481, 482.
- Authentic History*, none against a primeval civilization, iii. 125.
- Authority*, in the English church, as defined by Hooker, iii. 413.
- Authorities*, adduced, on the primitive state of man, iii. 88.
- Author* of the great salvation, ii. 606.
- Authors* of systems, always labour under prejudice, iii. 216.
- Auto-da-fe*, the spirit of, still among men, ii. 315.
- AYERS, ELIAS and MARY ANN, referred to, i. 14; iii. 52.
- B
- Babel*, tower of, its fate uncertain, iii. 107; opinions as to its object, 108.
- Babylon*, its ancient site unknown, iii. 107; its founder and glory, 129; its vast population, 180.
- Babylonians*, never described as barbarians, iii. 125.
- Baccalaureate Addresses*, Dr. Lindsley's, of 1826, i. 121; of 1827, 173; of 1829, 209; of 1831, 281; of 1832, 331; of 1834, 361; of 1838, 539.
- BACON, LORD, remark of, i. 264; great, like Burke, Selden, and others, from laborious study, ii. 178; his remark on revolutions, iii. 299.
- Bad habits* indulged in at church, iii. 621.
- Bad men*, not kept even from the apostolic church, iii. 404.
- BAILLIE, ROBERT, in the Westminster Assembly, iii. 432.
- BAIRD, DR. ROBERT, letter of, respecting Dr. Lindsley, iii. 20.
- Balls*, public, injurious effects of, iii. 599.
- BANCROFT, GEORGE, his opinion on the peopling of America, iii. 119.
- BANCROFT, DR., his *jure divino* doctrine of prelacy, iii. 414; its effects when first published, 415.
- Banishment*, of criminals, i. 248.
- Bank*, of England, the first on the modern plan, iii. 546; the first established in America, 546; of Venice, when established, 546; the best form of a national, 368, 369; constitutionality of a United States, 335, 336; pronounced constitutional by the Supreme Court, 337; necessity or expediency of, 338.
- Bankers*, private, in Europe, always manage well, iii. 363.
- Banking*, the evils of an injudicious system, i. 292; should be left free to individuals, iii. 353; by States, on borrowed capital, disastrous, 359; the true secret of every sound system of, 363; when judicious and well managed, a blessing, 360; the evils of the existing system incurable, 361-366; the Scottish system of, 363, 364; cost of the system in the United States, 586; injustice and absurdity of, 588.
- Banks*, why without credit, iii. 360; their stockholders imposed upon, 362, 367; general suspension of, in 1837 and 1839, 363; by what classes gotten up, 367; different kinds of, 368; responsibility of their officers, 366; number and expense of, in our country, 374; all fail, sooner or later, 363; unwise management of, in our country, 551; add nothing to wealth or capital, 586; poor widows and children, the sufferers by, 587; general estimate of, as an invention of civilized society, 552.
- Banks*, state and stock, not desirable, iii. 338; cannot create money, 359; wisdom and expediency of, doubtful, 352, 353; free, or state stock, article on, 584.
- Banks of Scotland*, the best in the world, iii. 552; characteristics of the system, 546.
- Banks and Brokers*, fragmentary thoughts on, iii. 545.
- Bank Corporation*, defined from existing facts, iii. 363.
- Bank Directors*, duties and responsibilities of, iii. 548.
- Bank Failures*, almost unknown in Scotland, iii. 364.
- Bank Notes*, useless without a specie basis, iii. 360, 365; should always be the actual representatives of gold and silver, 367.
- Bankrupt Law*, of 1841, iii. 320.
- Bankruptcy* of our country in 1842, iii. 355.
- Baptism*, one of the only two sacraments of Protestants, ii. 339; controversy concerning, 340; endless disputations

- on, iii. 208; the nature of the ordinance of, 402.
- Barbarians*, use of the term by the Greeks and Romans, iii. 123.
- Barbarians*, of Gaul and Britain, preached to by the apostles, ii. 611.
- Barbarism*, no return to, during the last hundred years, iii. 237.
- Barbarous Tribes*, the only method of civilizing, iii. 117.
- BARNARD, DR. HENRY, his American Journal of Education, i. 11.
- BAXTER and FULLER, examples of self-taught men, i. 445.
- BEATTIE, DR., quotation from his "Theory of Language," iii. 93; views of, on religious prejudices, 219.
- BELL, Governor, of New Hampshire, quoted on schools, i. 473.
- Beggar General*, of the University of Nashville, i. 430.
- Beggar on horseback*, article on, iii. 280.
- Belief* in Jesus as Messiah, the test of primitive discipleship, iii. 428.
- Belief* in testimony, natural to man, ii. 676-679; requires understanding, 673; influence of early education on, 222; against the evidence of sense, illustration of, 668; fixes on facts, and not their causes or modes of existence, 669.
- Belief* in a primeval savage state, accounted for, iii. 122.
- Believers* in Christ, future joys in store for, ii. 605.
- Believers* and *Non-believers*, all men divided into, ii. 603.
- Bench*, of judges, separate, proposed for the Presbyterian church, iii. 442, 443.
- Benefits* of Christ's death to believers, ii. 604, 605.
- Benevolence*, contrasted with ambition, i. 178.
- Benevolent Societies*, claims of, on the rich, ii. 38.
- BENGELIUS, quoted on the division of the earth, iii. 160.
- Berlin*, Faculty of its University, i. 403; education in, 239.
- Best System of Education*, that which secures the constant employment of the young, i. 92.
- Bible*, the noblest text-book of education, i. 50, 93; should be a daily companion of all, 94; ignorance of, the source of error, 166; the source of all true wisdom for young men, 166; recommended to college graduates, 206; the written constitution of Christianity, 323; only reformer of veteran criminals, 251; better understood in America than in other countries, 313; the study of, advocated, 274; the only source of Christian truth, 306; the true power of, 312; should be freely circulated, 324; commended as the guide of youth, 546; its careful study enjoined, 347-349; tends to foster patriotism, 550; the neglect of, fashionable, 167; practical influence of, on the young, ii. 17; the only source of true wisdom, 188; an interpreter of man's character, 244; teaches a knowledge of the world, 244; used as a class-book in Nassau Hall, 245; heaven's richest treasure to man, 246; exhortation to the study of, 292-294; the Christian's supreme standard of faith and practice, 341, 342; the true divine teacher, 449; must be read as a means of salvation, 620; comprises a complete system of truth, 644; adapted to man as he is, 663; does not demand a blind faith, 665, 679; canonical portions of, how determined, 666; question of its inspiration, 672; its teachings must be believed, 678; addressed to man as a free moral agent, 679; requires no belief in impossibilities, 681; how it appeals to conscience, 681; its doctrines, how treated, 686; its own best interpreter, 697; its attributes, 698; our only reliable historic guide anterior to Herodotus, iii. 127; its statements as to the earth's population, 182; not responsible for the conflicting dogmas drawn from it, 198; in what sense hard to be understood, 205; proper study of, tends to agreement on doctrines, 206; its great teacher, God himself, 220; full of lessons on the subject of government, 400; authoritative guide for the church, 402; supreme authority with Presbyterians, 433; paramount rule of action to all Christians, 451; necessity of circulating, an address, 459; withheld from the people in past ages, 460; translated into one hundred and fifty languages, 464; the true friend of liberty, 467, 469; source of liberty in all Protestant Europe, 469; charter of liberty to the American forefathers, 469; cause of difference between British and other colonists, 470; its enemies the enemies of human liberty, 470; excellence of its moral code never questioned, 472; vast body of the human family still ignorant of, 473; duty of circulating it, a part of religion, 474, 480; its claims vindicated, 479; its benefits to the world, 481; not chargeable with the errors of its friends, 482; what it reveals of God and man, 482; would make earth an Eden, if obeyed, 483; source of all true moral reforms among men, 483; its transforming power on the wicked, 484; its influence essential to the peace of society, 485; supplies the deficiency of human laws, 488; its consolations for the afflicted, 489; exalts the female sex to their proper rank, 490; effects on war

- and kindred evils, 491; cheapest remedy for the evils of society, 492; its influence on priests and politicians, 492; its priceless value, 501; influence on slavery, 665; guaranties freedom, civil and political, to every human being, 664, 670, 672.
- Bibles*, scarcity of, in 1825, iii. 466; deficiency of, still, in Christian nations, 474.
- Bible Society*, the American, when founded, iii. 465; a strong bond of union among Protestant Christians, 501.
- Bible Societies*, number of, iii. 465; alleged expensiveness of, 491; calumnies against, 498; blessed work of, defended, 499.
- Biblical Archæology*, Dr. Lindsley, professor of, iii. 399.
- Bigotry*, pervades the Christian church, ii. 314.
- Bigots*, cannot be Christians, ii. 681; more injurious to Christianity than infidels, iii. 309.
- Bigots and Persecutors*, their claim to charity, iii. 213.
- Bills of credit*, prohibited to the States by the Constitution, iii. 365.
- Biography of Dr. Lindsley*, iii. 9.
- Birmingham and Manchester*, needed in Tennessee, iii. 384.
- bishops*, import of the term in the early ages, iii. 429.
- Bishops*, European and American, how created, iii. 419; their claim to exclusive ordination, 419; Roman Catholic, their oath of allegiance to the Pope, 425; of the Methodist Church, their power, 429; of the Lutheran Church, their power, 429; Presbyterian, their duties, 449; how successors of the apostles, 450.
- Bishops and Presbyters*, of the New Testament, parochial and not diocesan, iii. 409, 417; very numerous in the early church, 410.
- Black Jews*, of India, their case considered, iii. 176.
- Black Skin*, a characteristic of man from the earliest ages, iii. 174.
- BLACKSTONE, SIR WILLIAM, quoted on religious toleration, iii. 211.
- BLAIR, DR. HUGH, quoted on man's primeval state, iii. 97; on the formation of opinions, 221.
- Blessings*, of the great salvation, described, ii. 604; of the gospel, must be diffused, iii. 479; of temperance, 513.
- Blood of Christ*, an atonement for sin, ii. 605; the price of salvation, 606.
- BLUMENBACH, his opinion of the Esquimaux, iii. 165.
- Board of Trustees* of the University of Nashville, honoured names of, i. 376; removals by death from, 594; letter of, respecting Dr. Troost, 639; their action at the death of Dr. Lindsley, 71.
- Board of Directors* of the New Albany Seminary, iii. 399.
- BOCHART and BRYANT, cited on the origin of Nineveh, iii. 129.
- Bodily Exercise*, the benefits of, i. 91.
- BOLINGBROKE, LORD, his tribute to the moral excellence of the gospel, iii. 472.
- Books*, a source of enjoyment, i. 84.
- Boon* of English prowess and chivalry, Americans' share in, iii. 231.
- Borrowers and Lenders* of money, alike honourable, iii. 548.
- Borrowing* of banking capital, wretched policy, iii. 359.
- Bounties* in favour of home products, objectionable, iii. 388-390; discontinued in England, 389; wheat-growers protected by, in Massachusetts, 389; silk-growers, in Tennessee, 389; can never sustain the silk business, 390.
- BOWDITCH, NATHANIEL, and other eminent men of science, iii. 116.
- BOWEN, GEORGE T., professor in the University of Nashville, i. 595.
- Boys*, at school and college, should not have much money, i. 391; why they do not learn, 558.
- BRAINERD and WHITEFIELD, model missionaries, ii. 73.
- Branch*, of a national bank, iii. 369.
- BRECKINRIDGE, DR. JOHN, referred to, iii. 21.
- Brevity of Life*, its lessons, ii. 183.
- BREWSTER, ELDER, in the Mayflower, iii. 439.
- BREWSTER, SIR DAVID, his opinion of Calvinism, ii. 358.
- Bright Side* of human history, iii. 236.
- Brighter Day*, its dawn anticipated, iii. 456.
- Britain*, island of, visited by the primitive preachers, ii. 611.
- British*, in China, iii. 299.
- British and Foreign Bible Society*, when formed, iii. 463; progress and results of, 464.
- British Domination*, resisted from the first by America, iii. 244.
- British Legislation*, objects of, towards American colonists, iii. 233.
- British Ministry*, strange mistake of, in the American war, iii. 245.
- British Press*, its tone towards Americans, i. 580.
- BROWN, DR. ISAAC V., letters of, respecting Dr. Lindsley, iii. 18, 48.
- Brown's History of Missions*, quoted, ii. 434.
- Brownists*, the name of a party of Independents, iii. 431.
- BROUGHAM and BENTHAM, their labours on the law, i. 223.
- BRYANT, his opinion on the peopling of the earth, iii. 128; on the ancient Egyptians, 146.

- Brute Creation*, entitled to the Sabbath of rest, ii. 90.
- BUCER, BEZA, and other Reformers, agreed with Calvin about the case of Servetus, ii. 350.
- BUCKLAND, the geologist, quoted, i. 630.
- Builders*, of Babel, a civilized people, iii. 109, 113; of Thebes and Tentyra, not savages, 136; of Memphis, Babylon, Tyre, and Carthage, legitimate Hamites, 166.
- BUNYAN, JOHN, like many others, supplied the defects of early education in after-life, i. 445; referred to, iii. 396.
- BURKE, EDMUND, quoted by Matthew Carey on persecutions in Maryland, ii. 375; remark of, on wisdom, iii. 557.
- BURNETT, JAMES, LORD MONBODDO, his *Origin and Progress of Language*, iii. 89.
- Burning of widows*, would not be tolerated on a plea of conscience in our country, iii. 426.
- BURNS, ROBERT, quotation from, iii. 554; referred to as the poet of democracy, 270.
- BURR, AARON, *Memoirs of*, iii. 333; might have been President contrary to the wishes of the people, 348; one of the earliest leaders of democracy, 353.
- Buying*, a fallacious popular dogma about, iii. 381.
- BYRON, LORD, quotation from, on Washington, iii. 262.
- C
- Cabinet*, the Presidential, in theory and in fact, iii. 326; need not always be a unit, 347.
- CAIN, the first city-builder, could not have been a savage, iii. 98.
- CALHOUN, JOHN C., his opinion controverted, iii. 381.
- Calling and Election*, every man's, to be made sure, ii. 615.
- Calls to repentance*, numerous and urgent, ii. 622.
- Calvary*, its bleeding victim an atonement for sin, iii. 488.
- CALVIN, JOHN, his view of the Eucharist, ii. 347; his treatment of Servetus, 350; his great error, 351; referred to, iii. 430, 435.
- Calvinism*, consistent with large and liberal charity, i. 53; the common creed of all the Reformers, ii. 348; system of doctrine denoted by, 349; its high antiquity, 349; the only system of religious truth a philosopher can maintain, 358; Bishop Horsley's opinion of, 359; always caricatured by its enemies, 359.
- Calvinistic System*, held by men of strongest intellect, ii. 358.
- Calvinistic Presbyterians and Puritans*, founders of American schools and colleges, iii. 434.
- Calvinists and Arminians*, their protracted wars, iii. 208.
- CAMPBELL, DR. GEORGE, quoted on Christian charity, iii. 210; on religious dogmatism, 219.
- Candidates* for admission into college, qualifications of, i. 101; for the medical profession, their term of study in Europe, 221; for the ministry, the education needed by, ii. 49; for political office, described, iii. 283; for State offices, the character demanded in, 310.
- Candour*, illustration of Dr. Lindsley's, iii. 536.
- CANNON and CARROLL, Governors, referred to, i. 594.
- Canting Demagogues*, art and hypocrisy of, iii. 495.
- Capital*, cannot be created by a government bank, iii. 359; its real owner should always employ, 363; amount of, sunk in strong drink, 524.
- Capitals of Europe*, all have their universities, i. 258.
- CAREY, MATTHEW, his essay and eulogium, ii. 374.
- CARNAHAN, DR. JAMES, president of Nassau Hall, iii. 23.
- Carnal and Fleshly*, signification of, in Scripture, ii. 566.
- Carolina*, how regarded as a name for all the States, iii. 385.
- Carthage*, ancient commercial grandeur of, iii. 169.
- Carthaginians*, their early knowledge of America, iii. 171.
- CARTWRIGHT, the Puritan, his views of church government, iii. 414.
- CATCOTT, quotations from, respecting the Atlantis of Plato, iii. 156-158; his work on the Deluge, in the library of Nassau Hall, 162.
- Catechism*, the Shorter, quoted, ii. 687.
- CATHERWOOD and STEPHENS, researches of, iii. 166.
- Catholic Church*, the visible, defined, ii. 329.
- Catholics*, early history of, in Maryland, ii. 375.
- Catholicity* of the temperance cause, iii. 540.
- Catholic Sentiments* of Chillingworth, iii. 217.
- CATILINE and CLODIUS, ancient demagogues, iii. 496.
- Catilines*, modern democratic, how they prevail, iii. 299.
- CATO, CECIL, COLBERT, referred to, iii. 326.
- Caucasian* and other races, the same now as at the beginning, iii. 174; never changes to the negro in any latitude, 175.
- Cause of Education* in Tennessee, a baccalaureate address, i. 119, 129.

- Cause and Effect*, incomprehensible nature of, ii. 679.
- Cavilling*, against colleges, answered, i. 555; against God, unreasonable pretexts for, ii. 388.
- Celebration of the Lord's Supper*, preparation for the, ii. 535.
- Celestial Charity*, influence and conquests of, iii. 456.
- Censorious Language* to be avoided in discussions, iii. 534.
- Centennial Birthday of Washington*, Dr. Lindsley's address on, iii. 229.
- Central School*, or university, desirable in each State, i. 504.
- Central America*, colossal ruins in, not the work of savages, iii. 166.
- Century*, first half, of American independence, how adorned, iii. 231; wonderful events and changes of the eighteenth, 235, 236.
- Centuries*, triumphs of the cross during the first three, iii. 520.
- Cessation from labour* does not fulfil the law of the Sabbath, ii. 93.
- Chaldea, Assyria, and Egypt*, fountains of civilization to all other nations, iii. 110, 113.
- CHALMERS, DR. THOMAS, views of, on the education of the poor, iii. 601; quotation from, i. 631.
- Champions*, of Christianity, their character in the Middle Ages, iii. 202; of monarchy, their arguments from Scripture, ii. 335.
- CHAMPOLLION, CUVIER, HAUY, and other great names, i. 446.
- Chancellor of the University of Nashville*, i. 29.
- Change of man's nature*, possible only to divine agency, ii. 514; effected under the influence of the gospel, 384.
- Change of opinion*, Dr. Lindsley's, respecting the dispersion at Babel, iii. 101.
- Changes*, physical and moral, continually taking place, ii. 227; partial, not to be confounded with hereditary, in man, iii. 176; in church polity, easily introduced, 419; for the worse, in the Presbyterian system, possible, 430.
- Character*, true test of, iii. 283.
- Character of Washington*, in public and private life, iii. 249, 251; its influence on the world, 235, 258; its symmetry and perfection, 259, 260.
- Charge to one taking the ministerial office*, ii. 656; to those who hear the gospel, 657.
- Charitable man*, character of, how formed, iii. 196.
- Charity*, Christian, spirit of, recommended, i. 202; its great Bible lessons, 324; its nature described, ii. 264; not to be measured by any money standard, 265; defined and exemplified by Paul, 266; essential attribute of ministerial character, 269; beneficial effects of, 274; illustrated in the apostolic church, 330; imperfectly understood by Christians, 369; pervading attribute of our religion, iii. 197; the scriptural rule for all controversy, 210; particular, better than general, 217; its measure and demands, 224; does not require fellowship with the unworthy, 452, 453; to be exercised towards those in error, 532; those at our doors not to be overlooked by, 663.
- CHARLES XII. and LOUIS XIV., referred to, ii. 256.
- Charter*, of Rhode Island referred to, iii. 293; of another national bank not desirable, 353; of banks, whose benefit secured by, 361.
- Cheap Government* secured by the American Revolution, iii. 254.
- Cheap Labour* in Europe no argument against American manufactures, iii. 380.
- Cheap Literature*, debasing influence of, at the present day, i. 647.
- Chemists*, their views of the nature of alcohol, iii. 516.
- Cheputchet*, the hero of, iii. 353.
- Chicago and Danville*, seminaries of, referred to, ii. 27.
- Chief of sinners* invited to Christ, ii. 616.
- Child*, every man's, ought to be educated, i. 226.
- Childhood*, unquestioning religious belief of, iii. 222; left to itself, degenerates, i. 70.
- Children*, how their first lessons are acquired, i. 129; learn much in infancy at the fireside, 130; cruel discomforts of, at school, 516; all in the State should be educated, 643; all must and will learn some religious creed, ii. 343; born with evil propensities, 504; docile credulity of, 676; of savages, how civilized, iii. 117.
- CHILLINGWORTH, WILLIAM, quoted on Christian unity and charity, iii. 217.
- China*, modern, an illustration of the populousness of the ancient world, iii. 183.
- Chinamen* of modern Christendom described, iii. 411.
- Chinese*, general character of, iii. 183.
- Cholera*, visitation of, to America, i. 362.
- CHRIST, the atoning sacrifice for sin, ii. 198; the centre of the gospel system, 199; his estimate of worldly riches, 225; purchased a great salvation for sinners, ii. 604, 606; satisfied the demands of law, 604; how he saves from sin and death, 605; divinity of, denied by descendants of the Pilgrim Fathers, 613; his kingdom not of this world, iii. 401.
- Christendom*, almost destitute of genuine Christianity, ii. 80; its sins of oppres-

- sion and cruelty, 312, 313; needs to be purified and converted, 371; united in the Bible Society, iii. 463, 501; people of, have more liberty than Pagan, 469; not yet all Christian, 481.
- Christian Activity* needed in our age and country, ii. 68.
- Christian Benevolence*, the nature of, ii. 313.
- Christian Character*, true standard of, ii. 322; not measured by nominal Christians, iii. 481.
- Christian Charity*, advocated and recommended, i. 272, 320, ii. 365; the power of, ii. 270; new development in our age, 431; universal claims of, iii. 479, 501; inconsistency of its professors, 663.
- Christian Church*, has some unworthy ministers, ii. 71; needs another Lutheran reformation in charity, 369; duty of every, 433.
- Christian Churches*, why creeds are adopted by, ii. 347; how they should treat each other, 365; danger and doom of unfaithful, 612.
- Christian Colonies*, effects of, ii. 313.
- Christian Countries* take the place once held by the Jews, ii. 603.
- Christian Courage* needed, ii. 327.
- Christian Ethics*, improvement in, ii. 311.
- Christian Fathers*, advocated man's original savage state, iii. 88.
- Christian Graces*, union of, ii. 598.
- Christian Honesty*, ii. 322.
- Christian Influence*, essential in all teachers of youth, ii. 507.
- Christian Ministry*, need of liberal learning in, ii. 41, 42; can be perpetuated only by educating men for it, 66.
- Christian Missionaries* the only civilizers of the Indian tribes, iii. 117.
- Christian Missions*, late commencement of, in the land of Luther, ii. 430.
- Christian Name*, paramount glory of, i. 588, 589.
- Christian Nation of Drunkards*, an anomaly, ii. 313.
- Christian Partisanship*, cause and cure of, iii. 224, 225.
- Christian Patriot*, conduct of the true, ii. 280, 682.
- Christian Professors*, need more charity, ii. 103, 270.
- Christian Religion*, laws and promises of, i. 275; the power of, 311; end and aim of, ii. 117; provides for both worlds, 186; invites investigation, 195; effects of, 235.
- Christian Solace*, strength of, i. 546.
- Christian Truth*, derived only from a careful study of the Bible, i. 306.
- Christian World*, aspect of the, ii. 310.
- Christianity*, not answerable for its unworthy professors, i. 273; pure spirit of, 274; consolations of, needed by all, 275; the only religion of educated men, 304; her credentials clear to all, 305; as taught by Christ, 305; her foes, 308; only religion conquering without governmental aid, 310; a science, 548; always maintained by men of learning, ii. 45-47; demands a perpetual living ministry, 66; has conquered but a small part of the world, 88; stands or falls with the Sabbath, 110; ameliorating power of, over nations, 235; blessed influence of, on individuals, 236; early modified by schools of philosophy, iii. 201; ends where persecution begins, 212; its independence of the State in the first centuries, 420; three distinct forms of, 427; formed a new era in human history, 460; stands always on its own merits, 493; the religion of the people before Constantine, 493; abused by its pretended followers, 494; not responsible for evils done in its name, 494; never endangered any human right, 495.
- Christians*, faithful, few in number, ii. 81; rejected by the world, 283; faith and charity of the early, 330; honest differences among, 331; true, to be known, not by their creed, but their temper, 344; have no right to impose creeds on each other, 344; nominal, the culpability of, 486; worthy, invited to the Lord's table, 558-560; primitive, on what profession admitted to the church, iii. 428; Protestant, too much divided since the Reformation, 461, 462; of all sects, appealed to, for the Bible Society, 471, 473; in what they may differ and yet agree, 501; slow to learn the truth on great practical questions, 523; their position as to the temperance cause, 533.
- Christmas*, article on, iii. 619; an occasion for gratitude, 619; proper observance of, 620.
- Church*, name of, applicable to all denominations of Christians, iii. 424; of Christ, stable foundation of, proved by history, 461; did not encroach upon the State in the time of Constantine, 421; when pure, has never sought alliance with the State, 422; the Presbyterian, how protected against unfaithful ministers, ii. 72.
- Church edifice*, the indecency of wearing hats in, iii. 622.
- Church-going* does not alone fulfil the law of the Sabbath, ii. 101.
- Church Government*, form of, not prescribed in the New Testament, ii. 334; the divine warrant of, 335; the Presbyterian form of, iii. 399; dispensations of, 400; primitive form did not keep out error and schism, 404, 405; no form of, proof against such evils, 404, 405; the several forms of, 403; no *a priori*

- argument for any one system, 403; scriptural basis of, how ascertained, 404; essential principles of, 405; claim of each form to be the best, 406; officers of the primitive, how ascertained, 409; the Scotch system always opposed to Erastianism, 408.
- Church Members* not the only persons bound to lead holy lives, ii. 191; to what extent bound by their creed, iii. 451.
- Church Officers*, the primitive, iii. 446, 447.
- Church of Rome*, why recognized by the English bishops, iii. 415; held by the Puritans to be no church, 415; pretensions and claims of, in this country, 425, 426.
- Churches*, of the Protestant Reformation, sad apostasy of many, ii. 431; established by law in every nation except our own, i. 312; intercourse of, with one another, ii. 357; how they ought to treat one another, iii. 452.
- CICERO, MARCUS TULLIUS, his definition of law, i. 299; quotation from, ii. 675; his opinion on the primitive state of mankind, iii. 87.
- Cider and Ale*, bearing of, used as a beverage, on the temperance cause, iii. 530.
- CINCINNATUS and ARISTIDES, noble types of mankind, i. 266.
- Cincinnatus of the West*, title applied to Washington, iii. 262.
- Circulation of the Bible*, a duty of Bible religion, iii. 474; a high and noble privilege, 480.
- Circulating Medium*, the best kind of, iii. 372.
- Cities*, in the time of Adam, why needed, iii. 98; the greatest known to history built soon after the flood, 130; of ancient Egypt, number of, 179; ancient American, by whom built, 167.
- Citizen*, of the moon, ought to be believed on his own testimony, ii. 676, 677.
- Civil Engineering*, should be taught in our colleges, i. 421.
- Civil Magistrates*, responsibilities of, to society, ii. 115.
- Civility*, the law of ministerial, iii. 453, 454.
- Civilization* flowing from the Garden of Eden, i. 69; rapid glance at its history, 434; may exist in the absence of all true knowledge of God, iii. 103; found in all the countries first occupied after the flood, 109, 113; traced to the plains of Shinar, 151; the condition of all the most ancient historic nations, 126; not attainable in a savage state except from foreign aid, 83, 114; the term not defined, but used according to custom, 135; not determined by the knowledge of the multitude, but of the few, 134; Grecian, derived from Egypt and the East, 152; Roman, derived from the Greeks, 152; of Modern Europe, whence derived, 152.
- Civilized Man*, always found somewhere on earth, even in the darkest ages, iii. 84.
- Civilized Nations*, the first mentioned in history, iii. 110, 113; many in their decline and ruin at the dawn of Grecian history, 124.
- Civilized Races* have in no instance become savages in their own country, iii. 187.
- Claims of the Bible*, iii. 479.
- Classes*, numerous, who must be liberally educated, i. 438; of men who cannot be disfranchised, iii. 301; of producers, all beneficial to society and to each other, 379.
- Classical Journal*, quotation from, iii. 88.
- Classical Learning*, defended as essential in education, i. 42; the advantages of, 105.
- Classical Professor*, the duties of, i. 106.
- Classical Schools and Academies* needed in every community, i. 135.
- Classical Studies* important in our academies, i. 526.
- Classification* of schools and seminaries, i. 127; of applicants for admission to college, 561.
- Classics*, the ancient, Dr. Lindsley's estimate of, i. 42; the study of, essential to a collegiate course, 105.
- Clergy*, agency of, in founding European colleges, ii. 52; their rights as citizens, 61; their usefulness to society, 62; disfranchisement of, in New York and other States, 60; character of, in established churches, 267; condition, in our country, different, 268, 269; American Presbyterian, have never persecuted, 353; whigs, in the Revolutionary War, 354.
- Clergymen*, American, all the friends of liberty, i. 326; not injured by a college education, 224; their wants and hardships, ii. 37; need a larger revenue as almoners to the poor, 38; ought to have a correct knowledge of the world, 49, 50; not eligible to civil office in Tennessee and other States, i. 487, ii. 60, iii. 296, 561; aims of all honest, ii. 64; their want of fidelity towards the rich, 328.
- CLINTON, GOVERNOR, on the common schools of New York, i. 518, 519.
- Code*, liberality of the Presbyterian ecclesiastical, iii. 452.
- Code of Honor*, unsupported by any rational argument, i. 193; a method suggested for the repeal of, 194.
- CODMAN, REV. DR., referred to, iii. 17.
- Coercive System* of education adopted in some countries of Europe, i. 645.
- Coin*, disadvantages of, as a circulating

- medium, iii. 372; liable to constant losses, 550.
- Coincidence*, curious one between Moses and Plato, iii. 161.
- Coldest Winters* known in our country, iii. 613, 628.
- COLEMAN, REV. THOMAS, Erastian, in the Westminster Assembly, iii. 432.
- Coleman's Antiquities* referred to, iii. 447.
- COLERIDGE cited on the destiny of America, iii. 555.
- College*, honours and rewards of, objectionable, i. 46; knowledge requisite for admission to, 101; qualifications of candidates for, 101; prescribed course of study in, 102; aim and end of education in, 110; not a place for reforming bad boys, 387; freaks of smart youth at, 562, 564; lads enter too young, 559.
- College Degrees*, conferring of, i. 357; views on, 557.
- College Government*, principles of, i. 44, 112, 114; should be parental, 112; not adapted to very young persons, 386; thoughts on, 363-365; should be a moral discipline, 369.
- College Graduates*, their character defended, i. 137; their love of liberty, 453; their different careers in life, 540-542; their follies and defects, 386.
- College Life*, an epitome of the great world, ii. 227.
- College and Academic Fund*, wasted in Tennessee, i. 497.
- College of New Jersey*, Dr. Lindsley, Vice-President of, i. 13; the source of its origin, ii. 52; use of the Bible in, 245.
- College of Nashville*, unappreciated by its own citizens, iii. 361.
- Colleges*, aid primary schools, i. 38; number of the Tennessee, 52; how and by whom established, 85; defect in modern, 91; not designed exclusively for the rich, 77; attempts in, to teach too hurriedly, 109; cannot be reared without expense, 136; unfounded popular prejudices against, 137; all may be improved, 143; objections urged against, 145; not exclusively for any one class, 145; advantages of home, 146; old might be equal to new, 153; often haunts of dissipation, 166; number in Ohio, Kentucky, and Tennessee, 213; genuine levellers of distinctions in society, 231; the poor derive the greatest benefits from, 231; cheap institutions compared with penitentiaries, 249; evils of sectarian, 255; effects of, widely diffused, 342; some men inveterate foes to, 395; hostility to, detrimental to the public good, 528; number of, in Tennessee, 570; grant for endowment of, 531; students of, exposed to intemperance, iii. 521.
- Colleges and Universities*, by whom to be established, i. 85; the temptations often fatal to the young, ii. 165, 166; how created in the West, i. 215; influence of European, 138.
- Colleges of America*, their standard of admission too low, i. 104; not yet perfect, 143; items indispensable to, 215; adapted to our people, 405.
- Colleges of ancient nations*, their influence, i. 343.
- Colleges of Europe*, position and influence of, i. 138.
- Colleges of Scotland*, i. 79.
- Colleges of sects*, how sustained, i. 255.
- Colleges of the West*, number of, i. 570.
- Colleges of various States*, i. 213, 216, 217.
- Colleges of Greece*, champions of liberty issued from, in their last revolution, i. 139.
- Collegiate Education*, Dr. Lindsley's plea for, i. 18; evils remedied by, 338; vindicated from objectors, 555-557.
- Colonial Governors*, American, their lordly proclivities, iii. 253.
- Colonial Legislatures*, American, always resisted tyranny, iii. 244.
- Colonial Pioneers* in the cause of learning, i. 211.
- Colonies*, American, their treatment of the Indians, ii. 311.
- Colonists*, original, of the United States, descent and character of, iii. 232; why superior to all others, 470.
- Colonization* never depopulates the mother-country, iii. 670.
- Colonization* of negroes in Africa, grandeur of the enterprise, iii. 578; the abolition opposition to it a benefit, 579; its influence on the African race in America, 664; cannot remove the race, 668, 670.
- Colossal Works* of antiquity, their origin, iii. 131.
- Combinations*, of tradesmen, for fixed prices, unwise, iii. 597.
- Commencement*, anniversary of, 1837, at Nashville, i. 375; in Eastern colleges a great occasion, 427.
- Commentaries*, the proper use of Scripture, iii. 220.
- Commerce*, of ancient Egypt in the time of Joseph, iii. 137; value of American, internal and domestic, 387.
- Commission* of the Church of Scotland, its early use, iii. 440; necessary for the dispatch of judicial business, 441, 443.
- Commissioners* of our General Assemblies, their capacity for business, iii. 442.
- Common Ancestry* of all men, assumed on Bible testimony, iii. 83.
- Common Law*, its theory admirable, i. 298.
- Common School Education*, what is meant by, i. 133.
- Common Schools*, great importance of, i.

- 131; create a demand for academies, 134; cannot be sustained without colleges, 235; the university the best friend of, 448; reformation to be effected by, 470; alone, not sufficient to educate the people, 528; those of Tennessee considered, 643; three great parties on, 648; dangerous when divorced from religion, 648.
- Commons*, the British House of, iii. 285; its action cited, 350.
- Communicants*, worthy and unworthy, at the Lord's table, iii. 497.
- Communion*, terms of courteous, between churches, ii. 452.
- Compass*, the mariner's, known from time immemorial, iii. 168; knowledge of, concealed by the Orientals, 169.
- Competitors*, foreign, yield to home, under a protective tariff, iii. 379.
- Condemnation* of the neglecters of the gospel, just, ii. 610.
- CONDICTS and LINDSLEYS, the families of, iii. 44, 45.
- Condition*, of the United States in 1842, financially, iii. 355; of society, when left merely to human sanctions, 486; of communities without the Bible, 500.
- Conduct*, of the unbelieving under gospel warnings, ii. 469; required by the Bible, 681.
- Confession of Faith*, the Presbyterian, articles of, cited, ii. 686, iii. 432, 433, 445.
- Conformity*, meaning of the term in the English Church, iii. 413.
- Confusion of Tongues* at Babel, its effects on the race, iii. 101, 113; how accounted for, 101; a punishment mingled with mercies, 173.
- Congregationalism*, somewhat Presbyterianized, iii. 438.
- Congress*, unjust laws of, iii. 320; legislative power vested in, 340; under the first administration, 335; no right to authorize or prohibit slavery in the Territories, 570.
- Connecticut*, public school system of, i. 471; objections to, 473; Constitution of, iii. 294.
- Connection*, intimate, between all the sciences, ii. 242.
- Conscience*, not the guide of public officers, iii. 314; the Presidential, 337, 369; not a safe rule of conduct, 341; when its demands must be allowed, 426; not to be enslaved by human authority, 451.
- Conscientiousness*, pleaded by the lover of gold, ii. 43.
- Consciousness*, the faculty of, in man, ii. 664.
- Consecration* of all to Christ, the great demand of the church, ii. 372.
- Consistency*, of character, needed in the service of God, ii. 257; developed only by a great object, 258; of opinion, often a bar to all improvement, iii. 218.
- Consolation* for life's woes, found only in the gospel, iii. 489.
- CONSTANTINE, the Emperor, how he became head of the church, i. 311; head of heathenism, iii. 421; why he adopted Christianity, 493.
- Constitution*, the Federal, final draft of, iii. 305; to be interpreted by the intent of its framers, 302, 317; cases of its wrong construction, 320, 321; articles quoted, 322, 371; strict and liberal interpreters of, 330, 350, 351; interpreted for the good of the country, 334; when by the letter and when by the spirit, 335; violations of, 340; vests all legislative power in Congress, 340; legislative construction of, 342; amendments to, suggested, 287, 321, 344, 349; requires a uniform paper currency, 371; where the letter fails, the spirit must govern, 568; how it may be perverted, 569; wise provisions of, i. 583.
- Constitutions*, American, in what derived from the British, iii. 285; in what defective, 287; good in proportion to their brevity, 294; allow no infringement of the rights of conscience, 426.
- Constitution of New York*, its excluding the clergy from office, ii. 60.
- Constitution of Rome*, under the consuls, iii. 345.
- Constructive Treason*, a dangerous instrument, i. 457.
- Consubstantiation*, Luther's doctrine of, an example of prejudice, iii. 215.
- Consumption*, articles of, taxable in a tariff, iii. 377; of wealth, caused by ardent spirits, 524.
- Contentment*, Christian, advantages of, ii. 261; taught by God's providences, 452.
- Contest*, the Revolutionary, its inequality, iii. 248.
- Contradictions*, to reason, not found in the Scriptures, ii. 672; may seem so because unrevealed, 673.
- Contrasts* between Pagan and Christian men, ii. 135; of character, suggested, iii. 571, 590.
- Contributions*, liberal, to Bible Society, iii. 500.
- Controversia Verbi*, illustration of, ii. 675.
- Controversies*, religious, largely attributable to prejudice, iii. 199; trivial character of, in the Middle Ages, 202, 203; acrimonious nature of most religious, 209; on episcopal power in sixteenth century, 414, 415.
- Convenient Season*, never comes to the procrastinating, ii. 617.
- Convention*, minutes of the Federal, iii. 317; should be known, to interpret the Constitution, 318.

- Converts*, never made by abuse and denunciation, iii. 209.
- Copernican System*, first discovered in Egypt, iii. 143.
- Copts*, of modern Egypt, no criterion of Pharaoh's wise men, iii. 145.
- CORNARO, the Italian, an example for young men, ii. 173-175.
- Corn Laws* of England, not the cause of her prosperity, iii. 393.
- Corporation*, civil, defined, iii. 362; not more reliable than individuals, 363; bank, defined, 547.
- Corresponding Members* of Synods and Presbyteries, iii. 454, 455.
- Cost* of intemperance in our country, iii. 491.
- Cotton*, the policy of England as to the growth of, iii. 383; American, ought to be manufactured at home, 384; where it may be cultivated, 650.
- Counsels* to the young, ii. 148, 149.
- Counterblast*, of King James, to tobacco, iii. 556.
- Counterfeit*, of godliness, described, ii. 584, 682.
- Country*, the love of, strong, i. 352; an agricultural, needs manufactures and a market for its products, iii. 381, 387.
- Countries*, all mentioned in Scripture, full of inhabitants, iii. 182.
- Courage*, the power of moral, described, i. 169, ii. 682.
- Courts*, of law, expensive and unsatisfactory, i. 296; separate ecclesiastic, suggested for the Presbyterian Church, iii. 442; one of supreme appellate jurisdiction needed, 444.
- Covetousness*, evidences of, ii. 43.
- CRANTOR, on Plato's Atlantis, with Ammianus Marcellinus, referred to, iii. 156.
- Creation*, of the universe, in what sense a mystery, ii. 640; of all plants and animals in a state of perfection, iii. 98.
- Credit*, better than money, iii. 360; State bills of, unconstitutional, 365.
- Creditors*, private, to be paid before government, iii. 321.
- Creed*, Dr. Lindsley's, on popular education, i. 500; of the Temperance Society, short and good, ii. 345; of all the Reformed Churches, Calvinistic, 348; no formal, required for salvation in the Scriptures, 680.
- Creeds and Confessions*, their place among Protestants, ii. 340, 341.
- Creeds*, necessity for, iii. 220; why adopted by Protestants, 451; theological, how adopted and held, 219; political, ecclesiastical, and literary, ii. 346; of the skeptics, most objectionable of all, 346.
- Criminals*, state, unknown in the American government, iii. 254.
- Crimes*, increase of, in Connecticut and New York, i. 507; amount of, from intemperance, iii. 507.
- Crisis*, in the American Union, in 1832, i. 332.
- Criterion* by which all must be judged, ii. 192.
- CROCKETT, SAMUEL, son-in-law of Dr. Lindsley, i. 15.
- CRÆSUS and SOLON, interview between, ii. 222, 223.
- CROMWELL, OLIVER, like Cæsar and Bonaparte, not to be envied, ii. 223; like Washington and Moses, the author of a revolution, iii. 563; compared with Fox, the Quaker, 564.
- Cross of Christ*, our true ground of glorying, iii. 224.
- CROSS, PROFESSOR NATHANIEL, referred to, iii. 27.
- Crowding* of studies in education, to be avoided, i. 109.
- Crown* of glory offered in the gospel, ii. 607.
- Cumberland College*, changed to University of Nashville, i. 13; Dr. Lindsley's views of, 19, iii. 23; its condition and prospects in 1825, i. 86; not a sectarian institution, 88; contemplated improvements in, 153, 156, 157.
- Cumberland Presbyterians*, their mistake in changing the Confession of Faith, iii. 436.
- Cumberland River*, at Nashville, described, iii. 613.
- Cure* for intemperance, a grand discovery, iii. 509.
- Currency*, paper, the only safe one, iii. 365; of some kind, essential, 367; indispensable elements of, 374; value of a national, 370; should be uniform, 371; advantages of, 372; compared with specie, 550.
- Custom*, tyranny of, i. 186.

D

- Damascus*, ancient, origin and history of, iii. 130.
- Danger*, of openly attacking prejudices, iii. 193; to American constitutional liberty, 257.
- Dark Ages*, of Europe, not destitute of all light, i. 73.
- Davidson*, Bible Society of, its objects and ends, iii. 465, 499; anniversaries of, 459, 479, 500.
- DAVIES, PRESIDENT SAMUEL, his labours in Virginia, ii. 715.
- Dawn* of a more charitable day anticipated, ii. 368.
- Deacons* in the church, first appointment of, iii. 446.
- Deaconesses*, female presbyters, iii. 447.
- Death*, provision for, recommended, i. 205;

- thoughts on the certainty of, 184; its terrible reign described, 216, 217; why dreaded by the aged, 220; the final criterion of happiness, 222; exhortation to prepare for, 298; its approach a restraint on the wicked, 463; a terrible messenger to sinners, 625; of Washington, universal sorrow produced by, iii. 234.
- Deaths*, yearly number of, ii. 216.
- Death-bed*, its lessons as to the value of time, ii. 221; a true test of all earthly things, 227.
- Debt*, a national, convertible into a sound paper currency, iii. 373.
- Decision* of character, necessary for the Christian, ii. 253; illustrations of, in history, 254; displays of, in private life, 255; may sink into self-willed obstinacy, 256; more than constitutional hardihood, 257.
- Decision* of Supreme Court to be obeyed, though not always right, iii. 319.
- Decline* of churches in some parts of the South, ii. 714.
- Defects*, in modern colleges, i. 91, 101; of our country, 244; in the Presbyterian system, iii. 440.
- Deficiency* of human laws remedied by the Bible, iii. 488.
- DE FOE, poetical quotation from, iii. 555.
- Degeneracy*, the law of human nature without education, i. 70, 71; of our race after the dispersion at Babel, iii. 101; strong tendency to, 113, 114.
- Degraded Classes* in Christian Europe and America, iii. 132.
- Degraded Varieties* of the human family may all be Hamites, iii. 186.
- Degrading Despotism* of intemperance long confessed, iii. 506.
- Degrees*, college, conferred on unworthy candidates, i. 557; of civilization in different ages, iii. 135.
- Deity*, universal belief in the existence of, ii. 440.
- DELAFIELD, JOHN, his work on American Antiquities, iii. 162.
- Delay*, danger and folly of, in matters of religion, ii. 718.
- Delhi, Pekin, Jeddo*, great population of, iii. 181.
- Deluge*, changes wrought by, on the earth's surface, iii. 101.
- Demagogues*, hypocritical defenders of the poor, i. 302; modern, described, iii. 277, 278; claim to be democrats, 300; their tricks on the people, 342, 343; often professors of superior sanctity, 495; generally declaim against the rich, 596.
- Democracy*, American, treatise on, iii. 317, 354; the best type of, 291; proper limitations of, 300; aims of, 301; its elemental principles, 299; display of, in Rhode Island, 295; may be tyrannical, 312; inconsistencies and contradictions of, 342.
- Democracies*, of ancient Greece and Rome, their aristocratic spirit, iii. 467, 468.
- Denominational Zeal*, illiberal display of, in schools and colleges, i. 257.
- Denunciation*, of churches from the pulpit, useless, iii. 452.
- Departments*, of government, subject to the President, iii. 323.
- Depravity* of human nature, evidences of, ii. 389; admitted by good men, denied only by bad, 477; not incompatible with a state of civilization, iii. 103.
- Descendants* of Shem and Japheth, their superior destiny, iii. 163.
- Description*, of Nashville, in 1830 and 1859, i. 57-59; of the modern genteel beggar, iii. 607, 609.
- Designation* of ancient bishops by their cities or sites, iii. 417, 418.
- Despotie Power* of prejudice illustrated, iii. 215.
- Despotism*, in France, demolished, i. 137; in ancient Egypt, productive of art, iii. 132; of the English established church, 416.
- Destroyer* of others a self-destroyer, iii. 537.
- DE WITTS, of Holland, referred to, iii. 282.
- Differences* among Protestant clergy, character of, iii. 208.
- Difficulties*, in the way of salvation, how removed, ii. 197, 390; of modern unbelievers, the same as in Paul's day, 671; unnecessarily created, 672; in Scripture, of what kind, iii. 206.
- Diffusion* of knowledge beneficial to all classes, i. 198.
- Dignitaries* of the English Church, their liberal views, iii. 411.
- Dilemma* to the American philanthropist touching African slavery, iii. 666.
- Diocesan Bishops*, as held by episcopal writers of sixteenth century, iii. 414; how their power first arose, 417; modern and ancient titles compared, 418; Roman Catholic and Episcopal contrasted, 419.
- Diocesan Episcopacy*, as expounded by English reformers, iii. 414, 415; its origin, 417.
- DIODORUS SICULUS, opinion of, concerning man's primeval state, iii. 85, 90; his description of the Egyptian priesthood, 138; corroborates the Mosaic history, 139; his supposed reference to America, 170; on the population of ancient Egypt, 178.
- Directors* of banks, should be few, iii. 366.
- Dirks*, the sporting of, by fashionable and precocious youth, condemned, i. 190.

- Disappointments* overruled for our good, ii. 453.
- Disappointed Ambition* in the church described, ii. 70.
- Disciple* of Christ, description of his true character, ii. 682.
- Discipline* of the mind, importance of, in academeical study, ii. 242.
- Diseordant Opinions* unnatural among friends of the Bible, iii. 197.
- Discourse*, Dr. Lindsley's, on the mysteries of God, ii. 631; his inaugural as Professor at New Albany, iii. 399.
- Discovery*, of the Christian duty of circulating the Bible, when made, iii. 462; of a cure or preventive for drunkenness, 509.
- Discoverers and Inventors*, distinguished, referred to, iii. 418.
- Discrimination* between articles in a tariff for revenue, iii. 378.
- Diseases* produced by the use of ardent spirits, iii. 517.
- Dismemberment* of the American Union a sad calamity, iii. 255.
- Dispensation*, of grace, the one we live under, ii. 710; difference of the Mosaic and Christian, iii. 401.
- Dispersion* at Babel attended by other great changes, iii. 174.
- Dissensions* among Christians, the causes of, iii. 204.
- Dissenters*, English use of the term not applicable in our country, iii. 423.
- Dissenters and Heretics* unknown in America, i. 318.
- Dissolution* of the American Union, too dreadful to think of, i. 333; who aim at it, iii. 435; a possible thing, 255.
- Distillation*, invented after the close of the Scripture canon, iii. 531.
- Distilled Liquors*, their use deleterious, iii. 529; ought to be abandoned as a beverage, 534.
- Distilleries*, a dead loss to society, iii. 525; their pernicious influences, 537.
- Distinction*, eminent, rarely attained among men, i. 555.
- Diversity*, of opinions, on the ways and means of education, i. 643; of animals, in the Old and New Worlds, accounted for, iii. 172.
- Division of the earth*, the first, as recorded by Moses, iii. 127; in the days of Peleg, meaning of, 160.
- Divines*, what they ought to be, i. 224.
- Divine Aid* needed by man as a sinner, ii. 687.
- Divine Agency*, necessary to change the heart, ii. 526; consistent with human ability, 527.
- Divine Existence* a mystery to man, ii. 640.
- Divine Government*, a sermon, ii. 439; a source of joy to men, 447; its grand end, 448.
- Divine Law*, obedience to, a duty, i. 175: requirements of, 176; binding authority on all, ii. 189.
- Divine Mediator*, his great atonement, ii. 703.
- Divine Providence*, dealings of, towards Christian communities, ii. 713.
- Divine Revelation* adapted to man as he is, ii. 663, 664.
- Divinity of Christ*, prominent doctrine in all Paul's writings, ii. 645, 646; rests not on abstract arguments, 691; denied by descendants of New England Puritans, 713.
- Divisions* among Christians began in the apostolic church, i. 332.
- Divorce* among slaves, what constitutes, iii. 582.
- Doctorates*, college, Dr. Lindsley's estimate of, iii. 41; might be assumed at pleasure, i. 557.
- Doctors*, ecclesiastical, their inconsistencies, ii. 327.
- Doctrine*, meaning of, in the New Testament, ii. 340, iii. 451; of a primeval savage state, whence derived, iii. 123; of the Trinity, properly called a mystery, ii. 638, 639; illustrations of, insufficient, 674.
- Doctrines*, of the Bible, why called mysteries, ii. 637; how treated, 686; their social tendencies, iii. 489; of past ages, many exploded, i. 285.
- Documents*, Congressional, iii. 317.
- Dogma*, the *jure divino* of high churchism, iii. 410; of the king's supremacy, corrupting and fatal to the church, 416.
- Dogmas* of Romanism now prevalent in our country, iii. 424, 426.
- Dogmatism* exhibited by all churches as to their form of government, iii. 406.
- Dogmatist*, the theological, described, iii. 218, 219.
- Dollar Standard*, republican nabobs of the, i. 395.
- Domestic Manufactures*, their advantages to a country, iii. 384; ought to be protected, 385.
- Domestic System* of education, recommended, i. 253; its advantages, 416.
- Domination* of factions in a republic sure to end in permanent despotism, iii. 257.
- Doom*, of the wicked, aggravated by rejecting the gospel, ii. 407; determined not by logic but the testimony of God, 692; of the youthful drinker of ardent spirits, iii. 521.
- Doomed Race of Ham*, the American savages, iii. 163.
- DORR, the Rhode Island rebel, iii. 297.
- Drunkard*, once regarded as a hopeless character, iii. 507; who most to blame for his ruin, 514.
- Drunkards*, their liability to all forms of disease, iii. 519; how led on to ruin,

- 521; often made by parents, 522; sometimes reclaimed, 527; made out of moderate drinkers, 533.
- Drunkenness*, the increase of, in our country, i. 183; the great evil of the times, 383; effects of, in South Carolina, 384; its debasing character, ii. 164; its extent and cost in our land, iii. 507, 514, 523; its dangers, 508; the pathology of, 517; horrors and crimes of, 520; its condemnation in Scripture, 531; fed by moderate drinking, 533.
- Duelling*, the practice of, how sustained, i. 192, 193; its relation to Christian gentlemen, ii. 313; must come to an end as the Bible prevails, iii. 491.
- Duty*, practical, not well understood by men, ii. 324; of observing the Sabbath, 87; of all men as to temperance, iii. 534, 535.
- Duties*, of the Sabbath day, enjoined, ii. 96; of ministers and hearers pointed out, 656; high import, adopted by all commercial nations, iii. 388.
- DWIGHT, DR. TIMOTHY, testimony for Presbyterian elders, iii. 438.
- E
- Early History* of civilization traced in the Bible, i. 67.
- Early Peopling* of America, objection to, considered, iii. 176.
- Early Piety* recommended, a discourse, ii. 121.
- Early Settlers* of Virginia and Maryland, ii. 374.
- Earnestness* the essence of persuasion, ii. 9.
- Earth*, its fertility and healthfulness before the flood, iii. 101; divided in Peleg's days, impoft of, 160; may have been once a continuous body of land, 172; more populous in ancient than modern times, 182.
- Eastern Colleges*, why attended by youth from the South and West, i. 260; their expensiveness, 261.
- Ecclesiastical Despotism*, the remedy for, iii. 497.
- Ecclesiastical History* harmonizes with civil and profane, ii. 507.
- Ecclesiastical Polity*, test of the best system of, iii. 399; the essential principles of, 404; cannot exclude error and schism, 404; primitive form of, the best safeguard for truth and holiness, 405; claim of all sects to have the most perfect, 406; of the Presbyterian Church, 399; of the English Episcopal Church, 413.
- Eclipse* of the sun a mystery to the ignorant, ii. 670.
- Economy*, contrast of the Jewish and Christian, iii. 401.
- Economical Government* best secured by a tariff on articles of consumption, iii. 377.
- Eden*, all civilization flowing from the garden of, i. 69.
- EDGEWORTH, BELL, and LANCASTER, eminent educators, i. 521.
- EDGAR, DR. JOHN T., referred to, ii. 24; his installation at Nashville, 303; eulogium on his piety and labours, 373.
- Editors* of newspapers and journals should be educated, i. 442; their power and responsibilities, 611.
- Education*, Dr. Lindsley's efforts in the cause of, i. 19; the birthright of every human being, 37; a great science, 47, 521; religion essential to, 47; study of the Scriptures needed in, 50; religious, need not be sectarian, 51; importance of, 65; many different systems proposed, 65; essential to all human progress, 70; consequences of a neglect of, 70; its influence on human nature, 70; the safeguard of human liberty, 75; advantages of a liberal, 81; its effects on the poorer classes, 82; promotes rational enjoyment, 83; great objects of physical, mental, and moral, 89; its effects upon the old Greeks and Romans, 89; leading defect in the American system, 101; grand aim of collegiate, 110; aim of elementary, 121; not finished with school or college, 121; united with liberty and religion in all ages, 126; essential to the well-being of society, 126; definition of, 127; evils arising from the want of, 126; the power of, 128; common-school or primary, considered, 133; collegiate, always the friend of liberty, 138, 139; Benjamin Franklin's labours in the cause of, 141; Washington's efforts in the cause of, 142; the great preventive of social disorders, 150; a remedy for the worst evils of society, 195; will diminish crimes, 198; the best fortune any child can have, 197; state of, in the valley of the Mississippi, 213; valuable to the mechanic, 225; a boon for the children of the poor, 230; enforced by law in some European countries, 240; effects of, in a republic, 242; system of Austria and France, 240, 243; the instrument of human improvement, 244; the sole means of popular reformation, 252; cheaper than the punishment of crime, 252; the legitimate ends of all popular, 301; political advantages arising from, 341; system of, at Geneva, in Switzerland, 414; expensive when youth are sent from home, 428; founders of our republic urged the necessity of, 467; its relation to matrimony, 483; of all children, how secured, 483; the prime object with all parents, 506; a subject on which all dogmatize too much, 521;

- worthy of profound study as a science, 521; a blessing placed within the reach of all, 500; the cause of, in Tennessee, 530; conceded by all men to be indispensable, 643; sentiment and habit of the people of the New England States in regard to, 645; a public better than a private, ii. 48; tendency of a private, 54; the chief cause of difference in social rank, iii. 114; a slow and difficult process to the child, 115.
- Education*, lecture on popular, by Dr. Lindsley, i. 463.
- Education* under private pastors not the best preparation for the ministry, ii. 54.
- Education*, ministerial, best secured in theological seminaries, ii. 55; objections to, answered, 56.
- Education*, in Tennessee, commonly prized for its costliness, iii. 603.
- Educational Articles* written by Dr. Lindsley, i. 32.
- Educational Systems* of the Old World, i. 243.
- Educated Classes*, how repelled from the pulpit, ii. 22; their patriotism and philanthropy, 137.
- Educated Parents* will always educate their children, i. 647.
- Educated and Uneducated*, the great distinction, i. 149, 150.
- EDWARDS, PRESIDENT JONATHAN, an example of courageous fidelity, ii. 329; referred to, iii. 435; in favour of Presbyterianism, 437, 438.
- Effrontery* of such as sit in judgment on Christians, ii. 193.
- Egypt*, ancient, a civilized nation in the time of Abraham, iii. 136; art and philosophy of, 136; priesthood and civil polity of, 138; one great monarchy from Abraham to Moses, 140; its weakness and disorders in subsequent times, 141; vast population of, 178.
- Egypt and the East*, civilized before the dawn of Grecian history, iii. 111; highly polished in the times of Hesiod and Homer, 125.
- Egyptian Art*, indestructible monuments of, iii. 145.
- Egyptian Bondage* of our American forefathers a popular mistake, iii. 244.
- Egyptian Colleges*, with those of Greece and Rome, i. 343.
- Egyptian Navies*, traces of, on American shores, iii. 167.
- Egyptian Sages*, their knowledge of astronomy, iii. 143.
- Egyptians*, the first known to history, civilized, iii. 136; like the Phœnicians and Chaldeans, never in a savage state, 151.
- Elders*, distinction between preaching and ruling, iii. 445, 447; opinions as to their term of office, 445.
- Election and Predestination* not incompatible with belief, ii. 673.
- Elective Franchise* for Federal officers, iii. 326.
- Electoral Colleges* should fill vacancies in cases of death, iii. 344; might be dispensed with altogether, 345.
- Elementary Principles*, of Presbyterian church government, iii. 400; their prominence in the New Testament, 404.
- Elementary Education* should be the same for all, irrespective of professions, i. 227.
- Elementary Schools* the first want of the people, i. 134.
- Elcusinian Mysteries* powerless compared with those of the gospel, ii. 650.
- Eligibility* to office, proper age of, iii. 287.
- ELIZABETH, QUEEN, despotic and persecuting character of, iii. 412, 414, 430.
- Eloquent Preachers* have many points in common, ii. 9.
- Emancipation* of our slaves, inevitable, iii. 668; should not be rash and sudden, 670.
- Embargo Act* of Jefferson's administration not liked by England, iii. 319.
- Eminent Men* always self-made, i. 342.
- Empires*, the greatest, of ancient times, formed by the children of Ham, iii. 128.
- Employment*, proper, the benefits of, i. 92; should be continued through life, ii. 179.
- Enactments* needed to secure universal education, i. 646.
- Enacritic Marble*, vast fields of, i. 630.
- End sanctifies the means*, adopted by some Protestants, iii. 599.
- Enemy of Education* the worst foe to his country, i. 77.
- Enemies of the Bible*, men of dangerous influence, i. 307; no friends of liberty generally, iii. 470, 498.
- England*, associations formed in, for mental improvement, i. 93, 123; her tariff and prohibitory policy, iii. 383; able to compete with us in growing cotton, 383; her judicious land-tax a cause of prosperity, 392, 393; her gold circulation deteriorated by sweating, 373.
- English Achievements* the common inheritance of Americans, iii. 231.
- English American Colonies*, secret of their successful revolution, iii. 240.
- English and Americans*, proverbially easy to be imposed on, iii. 607; conservative character of their revolutions, 562.
- English Colonies*, the master-spirits of, educated men, i. 453.
- English Established Church*, its fatal dogma of royal supremacy, iii. 416.
- English Hereditary Aristocracy* a bar to all democracy, iii. 253.
- English Liberty*, its safeguard in the House of Commons, iii. 329.
- English Literature* an American inheritance, i. 355.

- English Reformers*, their recognition of all Protestant churches, iii. 411, 415.
- English School System*, features of, i. 102.
- English Spirit* exhibited in the American colonists of 1776, iii. 234.
- English System of Law*, its unchangeable character, i. 298.
- English Universities*, the models of our own, i. 400; their splendid buildings, 401; compared with the German, 402.
- Englishmen*, in America, could not be taxed without their consent, iii. 246; the rights of, claimed by our Revolutionary fathers, 407; modern, unable to comprehend the working of our government, 242.
- Enormity* of sin not to be extenuated, ii. 691.
- Enterprises*, public, opposed in proportion to their excellence, iii. 463.
- Entertainment* offered in whiskey taverns, iii. 537.
- Enthusiastic Christian*, a defective character, ii. 546.
- Epicurean Philosophers*, their opinion of man's primeval state, iii. 85.
- Episcopacy*, its fierce combats with Independency and Presbytery, iii. 208; how it supplanted primitive Presbytery, 429; its controversies in the reign of Elizabeth, 415; lordly title of its bishops in the United States, 417-419.
- Equality*, of privileges in all parts of our Union, iii. 386; of rank secured by the American Revolution, 252.
- Erastians*, eminent and influential, in the Westminster Assembly, iii. 432.
- Erastianism*, opposed by the Scottish Presbyterians, iii. 408; elements of, in the English and Scotch Churches, 420.
- Error* to be distinguished from the errorist in discussion, iii. 426.
- Error and Superstition*, the source of, i. 166.
- Errors*, afloat in the world, ii. 364; fatal and delusive, on personal religion, 400.
- Errorists* can be won only by a gospel of love, iii. 452.
- ERSKINE, REV. DR., of Scotland, referred to, iii. 437, 438.
- Esquimaux*, descendants of Japheth, iii. 165.
- Essay*, Adam Ferguson's, on civil society, quoted, iii. 92.
- Essentials* of salvation distinguished from non-essentials, ii. 356.
- Established Churches*, antiehrastian, ii. 319; their neglect of foreign missions, 433; all more or less Erastian, iii. 420; their persecutions in the American colonies, 423.
- Established Church of Scotland*, always opposed to Erastianism, iii. 408.
- Established Church of England*, nature of her power, iii. 413; her ablest defender, Hooker, 412; the creature of the State, 420.
- Eternal Death* the doom of gospel-neglecters, ii. 702.
- Eternal Destiny*, fearful, of the impenitent sinner, ii. 708.
- Eternal Punishment*, the doctrine of, ii. 689; clearly taught in the Bible, 689.
- Eternal Sonship* of Christ, an unfathomable mystery, ii. 692, 693; the doctrine vindicated against objectors, 694, 695.
- Eternity*, no escape from, by sinners, ii. 624; full of terror to the unconverted, 624.
- Eternity of Matter*, bearing of the doctrine on an Eternal Creator, ii. 694, 695.
- Ethics and Religion* need to be well studied, i. 455.
- EUGENE ARAM and WILLIAM DODD, exceptional cases, i. 456.
- EULER, the mathematician, a Calvinist, ii. 358.
- Europe*, colleges and universities of, i. 138.
- European Aristocracy*, its prospective battle with the people, iii. 253.
- European Populace* compared with American, i. 241.
- European Revolutions*, radical defect of, iii. 242.
- European Sages* afraid of too much knowledge among the people, i. 302.
- Europeans*, their error as to the origin of American liberty, iii. 245.
- Evangelical Obedience*, nature and obligation of, ii. 576.
- Evangelical Repentance*, secures reformation of life, ii. 508; the work of a lifetime, 509; nature and duty of, 596; implies faith in Christ, 606.
- Events and Changes* in the world since the birth of Washington, iii. 235.
- Evidence*, adduced, of the beneficial tendency of learning, i. 139; of history, favours a primeval civilization of our race, iii. 125; sufficient for belief, found in the Bible, ii. 665; of Christianity, strong enough to convince Sir Isaac Newton, iii. 472.
- Evidences* of the gospel sufficient to win belief, ii. 484.
- Evils* of slavery to be ameliorated and abated, iii. 583.
- Example* of Washington, its influence on mankind, iii. 235, 258.
- Examples* of the power of prejudice cited, iii. 214.
- Exchange* of pulpits, the true rule for, ii. 366, iii. 454.
- Excuses*, inconsistent, of those who neglect the gospel, ii. 516, 719.
- Executive* proclaimed a co-ordinate branch of the legislature, iii. 341.
- Executive Veto* should be abolished, iii. 344.
- Exhortation* to sinners to accept of salva-

- tion, ii. 531; to half-believing Christians, 556.
- Existence* of man's savage state accounted for, iii. 83.
- Expense*, comparative, of prisons and colleges, i. 249; enormous, exacted by fashion, 501; of vice and crime, great, iii. 492.
- Exploring Expedition*, an ancient, iii. 167.
- Experiment*, the true criterion in personal religion, ii. 401; of self-government, the grand problem in America now solving, i. 199.
- Expostulation*, earnest, with the unconverted, ii. 720.
- Extension* of slavery into new territory, effect of, iii. 569.
- External Duties* not sufficient in religion, ii. 102.
- Extraordinary Men* raised up for extraordinary times, iii. 249.
- Extremes* in social condition no disproof of civilization, iii. 134.
- F
- Fables* of Titans and Giants, their origin, iii. 128.
- Facts*, most important, recorded by Moses, i. 66; illustrative of the superiority of Christians over Pagans, ii. 136, 137; intelligible to man when their nature is not fully understood, 640, 641; many mysterious, both in nature and revelation, 642; must be received on evidence, however mysterious, 653; doctrinal, of the Bible, how established, 667; the essence distinguished from the mode of, 670, 676; mentioned by Moses, their disproof of a savage state at the first, iii. 99; important, on the population of the ancient world, 177-179.
- Faculty*, of the Nashville University, i. 376; of the University of Berlin, 403; of philosophy in Germany, its import, 403.
- Faculties*, of Law, Medicine, and Theology in universities, i. 400; of German universities, 402; of the University of New York, 420.
- Faculties*, in man, the means and sources of knowledge, ii. 664.
- Fairs* for benevolence deceptive and injurious, iii. 599.
- Faith* in Christ essential to salvation, ii. 127, 681; as a principle, must supply the lack of knowledge, ii. 456; the mainspring of Christian practice, 570; not required in the Bible without sufficient evidence, 665; the doctrine of justification by, 687; nature and object of all-saving, iii. 450, 451.
- Faithful Minister* of the gospel, his character described, ii. 269; his duties and aims, 304-308; a rich blessing to any people, 658.
- Fall* of man in Eden, its fatal consequences, ii. 530, iii. 103.
- False Estimates* of God's service, ii. 124.
- False Prophets* in the Christian Church, ii. 309.
- False Religions* better than none, ii. 109.
- False Teachers* of the gospel, numerous and dangerous, ii. 488.
- Fanaticism*, religious, its power, iii. 496.
- Fanatics and Agitators* of New England, i. 510.
- Farewell Sermon* of Dr. Lindsley, at Princeton, ii. 249, 299.
- Farewell Address* of Washington, its character, iii. 229.
- Farmers*, their advantages, i. 124; should be educated, 224; the sovereigns of the country, 225; have leisure for study, 227; the best officials, 488.
- Farmers and Mechanics*, need more than a primary education, i. 197; should have collegiate culture, 224, 225; their cause pleaded, 349; too much governed by lawyers, 349; their honourable calling, 350; should be regarded as peers and judges, iii. 275; often deceived by demagogues, 278; a hint to, 316; their veto invoked, 346; their interests promoted by a tariff, 391; what they should aim at, 394; the classes producing eminent men, 395; important counsels to, 395.
- Farmers and Mechanics* of Tennessee able, if they would, to educate their children, iii. 271.
- Farmers, Mechanics, and Schoolmasters*, three most ancient and useful classes, iii. 267, 273; their spheres defined and described, 272.
- Fashion*, the universal sway of, i. 186; its grinding tyranny, 501; its fatal power in leading to drunkenness, iii. 508.
- Fashionable Gentleman*, a picture of, i. 190.
- Fashionable Religion* may be a most fatal error, ii. 363.
- Fashionable Vices*, their prevalence in society, ii. 314.
- Fatal Mistake* of the British Parliament in taxing America, iii. 246.
- Fate* of other republics no criterion for ours, iii. 245.
- Fathers* of the Christian Church, learned men, ii. 46; their testimony on church government, iii. 404.
- Fathers*, our gallant American, proofs of their prowess, iii. 232; nature's noblemen, 243; learned the art of government in the school of experience, 244; republican and self-governed from the first, 244; a libel to say they were ever enslaved, 245; their conservative and patriotic character, 406.
- FAUST, FRANKLIN, and COLUMBUS referred to, ii. 418.

- Favour of God* secured by the death of Christ, ii. 705.
- Fear of God* the true source of moral courage, i. 170.
- Fearful Peril* to the American Union in 1832, i. 336.
- Federal Constitution*, how interpreted, iii. 317.
- Federal Government*, its deficiencies, iii. 302; who are bound by it, 303; more monarchial than that of England, 328; reasons for this opinion, 329; its relation to a national bank, 369; ought to protect home industry, 385; calculated for indefinite expansion, 562.
- Federalist*, a commentary on the Constitution, iii. 318, 341.
- Federalists and Republicans*, the original parties, iii. 331.
- Federative Republic*, nature of the American, iii. 254.
- FELLENBERG, his labours at Hofwyl, to educate the poor, i. 94, his system applied to American youth, 96.
- Fellowships* in English universities, the benefits of, i. 402.
- Female Sex*, degradation of, in Grecian and Roman republics, iii. 468; exalted to their proper rank by the Bible, 490.
- FENELON, referred to, as an example of suffering wrongfully, ii. 282; as a writer on education, i. 522.
- FERGUSON, ADAM, referred to, i. 441, iii. 92, 396.
- Fermented Liquors*, their bearing on the temperance cause, iii. 529; their use as a beverage, how regulated, 534.
- Fidelity*, required of all Christ's ministers, ii. 632; how best exhibited, 643.
- Finances*, every thing in a State dependent on the administration of, iii. 334.
- Finite Creature*, incapable of an infinite work, ii. 690.
- FINLEY, REV. ROBERT, referred to as a teacher, iii. 11.
- Fires* of persecution cannot keep the church pure, iii. 482.
- First Colleges* in America, their alumni patriots, i. 211.
- First Impressions*, Dr. Lindsley's, of General Washington, iii. 234.
- First Occupation* of man in Eden mechanical, iii. 265.
- FLETCHER, ANDREW, quoted on patriotism, iii. 554.
- Folly* of rejecting the salvation of the gospel demonstrated, i. 165, ii. 717.
- Fools and Wittlings* reprov'd, ii. 240.
- Force of Truth*, Scott's, quoted on the power of prejudice, iii. 215.
- Forefathers*, American, their objects in coming to the New World, iii. 232; their regard for the Bible, 469.
- Foreign Beggars*, their modes of living in our country, iii. 608.
- Foreign Competition*, effect of excluding, on manufactures, iii. 387.
- Foreign Immigrants* to this country all become Anglo-American, iii. 562.
- Foreign Missions* a remedy for party feuds in the church, ii. 435.
- Foreigners*, their influence as to our government, iii. 312.
- Formality*, effects of, in the church, ii. 712.
- Forms*, of Christianity, three distinct, iii. 427; of civilization, diversified by ages and countries, 135; of church government, not essential to salvation, ii. 336; insufficient to keep out error, iii. 404; not discussed in the New Testament, 489.
- Founders* of Princeton Theological Seminary, eulogium on, ii. 75.
- Fourth of July*, orators produced by, iii. 312.
- Four Years* too long for a Presidential term of office, iii. 345.
- France*, education in, i. 243; her experiment of abolishing the Sabbath, ii. 109; civilized, despite the ignorance of the masses, iii. 134; her example shows the danger of attacking all religious prejudices, 194.
- FRANKLIN, BENJAMIN, his example as a mechanic, i. 124; his labours in the cause of education, 141; never forgot the poor mechanic, 269; his efforts to diffuse useful knowledge, 286; referred to, with other great discoverers, ii. 417, iii. 36, 238, 282, 396.
- FRANKLIN and WASHINGTON, what they might have been without education, i. 436; where and how they studied, 437; both liberally educated, after all, 437.
- FREDERICK THE GREAT referred to, i. 317, ii. 135.
- Free Agency* of man, a matter of consciousness, ii. 528; consistent with God's government, 673.
- Free Banks*, the State system of, bound to fail, iii. 549; objections to, 584; number and basis of those in Indiana, 585.
- Freedom and Slavery*, relation of the colored race to, iii. 583.
- Freedom* of opinion and speech, secured by the American Revolution, iii. 254; how limited, 308.
- Free Government* maintained only by knowledge and virtue, i. 74.
- Freemasonry* a burden on the labouring classes, iii. 598.
- Free Negroes*, questions as to their condition and destiny, iii. 581.
- Free Trade*, theory and practice of, iii. 382; necessary between States of the Union, 387; to be universal, must be international, 383; compared with a tariff policy, 559.
- FRELINGHUYSEN, HON. THEODORE, re-

ferred to, iii. 13; letter of, respecting Dr. Lindsley, 20.
French Colonies in America, cause of their difference from the English, i. 314.
French Revolution, by whom originated, i. 451.
Friends, or Quakers, their church government, iii. 403.
Friends of Liberty, should be advocates of the Bible, iii. 469; appealed to, in behalf of the Bible, 470.
Friendship not a delusion, its nature and value, ii. 294.
Fugitive Slave Law, remarks on, iii. 582.
Full-grown Infaney not man's original state, iii. 112.
 FULTON, ROBERT, referred to, iii. 396.
Funds of Colleges perverted or withheld, i. 351.
Funeral, services at Dr. Lindsley's, iii. 75, 76.
Future Punishment, like future reward, must be eternal, ii. 492; so because sin is eternal, 689-691; influence of the doctrine of, iii. 485.

G

GALLATIN, ALBERT, referred to, iii. 327.
 GALILEO, and others, illustrating the benefits of hard study, i. 447, ii. 239.
Gamaliels of ancient Egypt, and modern pedagogues, iii. 149.
Gambling, compared with gaming, i. 191; its horrible effects, 191; different kinds of, 294; licensed establishments for, iii. 391.
Gaul and Seythia early subdued by the gospel, ii. 704.
 GEBELIN, work of, on the primitive state of mankind, iii. 88.
General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, a divine institution, iii. 400; its capacity for judicial business, 441; time of its continuance in session, 430; a commission of, proposed, 440; some changes necessary, 443; one supreme court of appellate jurisdiction suggested, 444.
General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in 1834, its parties, iii. 46; in 1855, action on the death of Dr. Lindsley, 68.
General Assemblies, Presbyterian, conservative character of, iii. 435.
General Learning, a wide range of, desirable, i. 108.
General Inspiration of the Scriptures, what it means, ii. 666.
Geneva, the University of, i. 413; preparatory school at, 415.
Genevan System of education described, i. 414.
Genius, illustrations of its attributes, i. 617; its aims, 618; unavailing without study, ii. 178.
Genteel Beggars, article on, iii. 607.
Gentleman, different views of what constitutes, i. 190.
Geologist, object of the, i. 627.
Genuine Divinity learned only from the Scriptures, iii. 206.
German Divine quoted on educated men, i. 527.
German Universities, i. 243; description of, 402, 403; honours and emoluments of their professors, 404; their discipline not for boys, but men, 405.
Germany, the cotters of, i. 241; effects of literature in, 452; Christian missions of, ii. 430; highly educated, but not the freest country of Europe, iii. 240.
 GERRY, ELBRIDGE, his opinion on a national bank, iii. 352.
 GIBBON, EDWARD, his tribute to the purity of the early Christians, iii. 472; his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* quoted, 473; referred to, 180.
 GIBBS, ALPHONSO, referred to, i. 363.
 GILLESPIE, REV. GEORGE, in the Westminster Assembly, iii. 432.
Giving, in the spirit of charity, never impoverishes, iii. 475; freely, the essence of the gospel, 480.
Glory, of God, the supreme object of the Christian, ii. 578; of English history, belongs equally to America, ii. 230.
Gnats and Camels, political and democratic, iii. 342, 343.
Gnostic Heresies, origin of, iii. 200.
 GOD, the source of all good influences, i. 118; absolute authority of his commands, ii. 103; to be remembered in youth, 123; his moral character worthy of our love, 125, 126; must be served according to his gospel, 127; his wisdom displayed in the work of redemption, 200; his service incompatible with that of Mammon, 226; his paramount claims to our service, 252; the only source of pure felicity, 263; supreme object of our lives, 275; his government a source of encouragement in labour, ii. 461; not the author of sin, according to Calvinism, 360, 672; his purposes unfathomable to us, 388; the creator of the universe, 672; his providence over all things, 673; his testimony must be accredited, 679; a Spirit, infinite and eternal, 680; as Father and Son, relation between, 682; as eternal creator and eternal cause, 683; his omnipresence a restraint on crime, iii. 487; our personal accountability to, 502.
 GODFREY, HADLEY, and NEWTON referred to, iii. 418.
 GODWIN and HUME, referred to, ii. 135.
 GÖTIE, remark of, on the acquiring of languages, iii. 556.

- GOQUET**, his Origin of Laws, Arts, and Sciences, iii. 88.
- Golden Age*, none on earth since the fall in Eden, ii. 505; of fiction, solved by Moses, iii. 102.
- Gold*, its loss by sweating, iii. 371, 373.
- Gold and Silver*, only legitimate basis of banking, iii. 549, 585; its loss by circulation unfits it for currency, 550.
- Good Advice* for mechanics and farmers, i. 348.
- Good Men* must always suffer persecution, ii. 283.
- Goodness*, genuine, in what it consists, i. 175.
- Gordian Knot*, must be cut when it cannot be untied, iii. 166, 385.
- Gospel of Christ*, requires a spirit of purity, peace, and love, i. 174; its consolations needed in life, 275; not a foe to thrift and industry, ii. 34; not derogatory to the law of God, 87; its influence on man's character and destiny, 133; favourable to patriotism and love of country, 147; friendly to the interests of communities, 148; gains nothing by its friends compromising with the world, 226; its promises and rewards secure, 236; its adaptation to man as a sinner, 391; its teachings, 405, 479; early perversion of, 429; an adequate remedy for sinners, 479; its proffered blessings, 480; demands the closest scrutiny, 483; evidences of its divinity, 484; distinguished by its sublime mysteries, 637; force of its truths, 648; its great salvation needed by all, 695; what it includes as a remedy for sin, 696; no escape for the neglecters of it, 696; corrupted by Greek and Roman philosophy, iii. 200; early obstacles overcome by, 201; rejected by some because of the persecuting spirit of its professed disciples, 211; free from rites and ceremonies in the Jewish sense, 402; its success under the labours of the apostles, 460; its diversified progress since the Reformation, 461; the only protector of the female sex, 490; its spirit repugnant to any monopoly of blessings, 479, 501; must be imparted to others, or else its blessings will be lost, 480.
- Gospel Ministry*, chief qualifications of, ii. 22; great importance of, 40; the main pillar of society, 63; essential to the stability of government, 63; depository of the learning of ages, 63; its grand work and aim, 51.
- Gothic-English* system of bench-made law, i. 223.
- Goths and Vandals*, why they do not still overrun Europe, iii. 237.
- Government of God*, over all things, ii. 439; universal and particular, combined, 441-444; a cause of joy to good men, 447.
- Government*, all human, ordained of God, iii. 449; needs the influence of the Sabbath, ii. 110; heathen, not interfered with by the apostles, iii. 489; free civil, how maintained, i. 74; ought to provide for the education of the poor, 234.
- Government*, American Federal, the creature of the people, iii. 274, 276; dangerous innovations in, 329; need of reform, 281; though democratic, may be tyrannical, 312; a privileged creditor, 320; its inherent right to charter banks, 336; right to make internal improvements, 338; what it can do for the people, 354; tested by the character of the people, 355; the best system defined, 358; any systematic policy better than irregularity, 358; cannot create money out of nothing by banks, 359; its relation to a sound paper currency, 370; its paper better than a national bank, 373; made economical by a tariff on consumption, 373; should protect home industry, 385; how it may be destroyed, 256, 257.
- Government of the church*, the best system of, iii. 402; the Judicious Hooker on, 403; divine forms of, 403; details of, not stated in the New Testament, 404; the fundamental principles of, 404.
- Government of colleges*, the essential elements of, i. 110, 112, 114.
- Graces of the Spirit* partially possessed by Christians, ii. 395.
- Graduates of American colleges*, their high character, i. 331; English and American, their comparative advancement, 401; of the University of Nashville, 54; number living in 1834, 363; their modesty, 572; number of, at the university, 569.
- Graduating Classes*, addresses to, i. 268, 357.
- Grammar Schools* in England, i. 102.
- Grand Heresy* about education, its origin, i. 226.
- Gratitude*, definition of, iii. 563.
- Gratuitous Education* never highly prized, iii. 565.
- Gravitation*, the fact of, used to illustrate Scripture mysteries, ii. 641.
- Great Britain*, effect of her policy towards the American colonies, iii. 233.
- Great Characters* in history, formed on Bible principles, ii. 135, 136; their indebtedness to seminaries of learning, i. 343; in America, mostly from the ranks of the poor, 394.
- Greatness*, the foundation of true, laid in youth, ii. 146; of the gospel method of salvation, 698.
- Great Salvation*, a sermon on the, ii. 701; how secured, 720.

Great University, ought to include all professional education, i. 401; one for each American State needed, 406.

Grecian Sages, in what schools they graduated, iii. 134; why they went to school in Egypt, 148.

Greece, effects of learning in modern, i. 451.

Greece and Rome, morals and religion of ancient, ii. 419; their people strangers to true liberty, iii. 467; idolized liberty as a phantom to fight for, 468; degraded the female sex, 468; at best, turbulent aristocracies, 469.

Greeks and Romans, their moralists destitute of true knowledge, ii. 421; their historians on man's primeval state, iii. 119; behind the Orientals in navigation, 169; used too often as a standard to measure all ancient nations by, 184; education of the people among, i. 72, 521; their schools and gymnasia, 89, 91.

Greeks, degeneracy of, i. 69; not the originators of civilization, iii. 110; once fierce and untamed barbarians, 111; of the heroic ages, how civilized, 121; indebted to foreign aid for their culture, 123; largely to Egypt for letters, arts, and philosophy, 127, 141, 142.

GREEN, DR. ASHBEL, referred to, iii. 23; his presidency of Nassau Hall, 437.

Greenwood Seminary referred to, i. 31.

GRINDALL, ARCHBISHOP, not a persecutor, iii. 415.

Guilt of sin, transeends human thought, ii. 681; aggravated by rejecting the gospel, 702; measured by privileges abused, 703.

H

Habit, of reflection, must be cultivated in youth, i. 282; of intemperance, gradually formed, iii. 521.

Habitual Drinking of ardent spirits makes drunkards, iii. 533.

Habitual Use of fermented liquors, how estimated in Scripture, iii. 531.

HALE, SIR MATTHEW, referred to, iii. 324.

Hale's Analysis of Chronology cited, iii. 131.

HALL, ALLAN A., his tribute to the genius and character of Dr. Lindsley, iii. 73.

HALL, EDWIN, his work on the Puritans and their principles, iii. 414.

HALL, REV. ROBERT, his catholic spirit, iii. 207.

HALLEY, the astronomer, reproved by Sir Isaac Newton, iii. 472.

HAM, his curse, in the savage races of America and Africa, iii. 187; remarkable doom of his posterity, 163.

HAMILTON, ALEXANDER, referred to, iii. 323, 327; his financial policy, 334; able expounder of the Constitution, 341, 342.

HAMILTON, PROFESSOR JAMES, referred to, i. 595, 596, iii. 52.

HAMMOND, with other learned divines, referred to, ii. 47.

HAMPDEN, SIDNEY, RUSSEL, labours of, in the cause of liberty, i. 284.

Happiness, secured only in God's service, ii. 128-130; unattainable by the votaries of this world, 262; on what terms offered in the gospel, 702.

HARRISON, GENERAL, referred to, iii. 278.

Harrard University, revenue of, i. 216; number of professors and tutors in, 416; like Yale and Nassau Hall, founded by Calvinists, iii. 434; names of men immortalized in, i. 159.

HAZAEI, the example of, cited, iii. 353.

Heads, of families, their responsibility under God's law, ii. 89; of departments in the government, should be independent, iii. 328.

Heart of man, its wickedness disclosed, iii. 488.

Heat and Cold, alternations of, in Tennessee, iii. 626.

Heathen, all of one depraved character by nature, ii. 648; their philosophy, teachings of, 287; their sages, contrasted with Christian, 136.

Heathen Nations contrasted with Christian, iii. 481.

Heaven of the Bible described, ii. 118.

Heavenly Wisdom, what it promises and secures, ii. 201; how attained, 712.

Heliopolis, the Egyptian seat of sun-worship, iii. 142.

Hell, sin constitutes, ii. 383.

Helplessness of man as a sinner, and his remedy, ii. 520, 687.

HENDERSON, ALEXANDER, in the Westminster Assembly, iii. 432.

HENDERSON, DR., his testimony on education in Iceland, i. 518.

HENRY THE EIGHTH, made himself Pope of England, iii. 416, 430; never a true Protestant, 416; his policy of burning and hanging, 416.

Hercules and the Wagoner referred to, iii. 275.

Heresy, on the subject of education, i. 226; in the English legal sense, unknown in our country, 423; what it is in the Church of Rome, 424.

Heresies in the early church, cause of, iii. 202.

Hero of New Orleans at Nashville University, i. 158.

HERODOTUS, on the primitive state of man, iii. 90; testimony as to early civilized nations, 124; opinion as to the antiquity of the Egyptians, 127; witness as to the ruins of the tower of Babel, 107; testimony as to the wisdom of Egypt, i.

- 139, 140; his account of Cræsus and Solon, ii. 222.
- Heterodox Churches* not to be converted by denunciation, iii. 452.
- HETHERINGTON, his *History of the Church of Scotland* referred to, iii. 411, 431, 441, 446; quoted, 414, 415, 431.
- HEYNE, his seminary at Göttingen, i. 103.
- Hierarchy*, Romish, the most crafty contrivance of Satan, iii. 422.
- High Churchism*, arrogant claims of, iii. 410; how it should be dealt with, 411.
- High Life* in America, its absurd pretensions, i. 189.
- Highway Robbery* diminished by the use of paper money, iii. 372.
- Hint* to the Easterns, an article, iii. 636.
- History*, all human, founded on testimony, ii. 677; of man in all nations, a record of his depravity, 506, 508; argument from, on the primeval state of man, iii. 119, 125; knows no period when all men were savages, 151; early, of Greece, why so fabulous, 122; stream of civilized, how traced, 110; of England, part and parcel of American glory, 230; of the past century, its grand characteristics, 236; of Christianity, the history of learning, ii. 47; of collegiate or university education, 343, 435; of the church, a proof of man's depravity, 507.
- Historians*, the earliest, testify of a preceding civilization, iii. 124.
- Historic Character* of ages and nations depends on the educated few, iii. 134.
- HOBBS and other infidel writers referred to, i. 152.
- HODGE, DR. CHARLES, his *History of the Presbyterian Church*, iii. 438-440; advocates a commission of the General Assembly, 440.
- Hofwyl*, Fellenberg's school at, i. 83, 94; the rich and the poor educated at, 94.
- Holiness*, indissolubly connected with happiness, ii. 583; of life, required in the Scriptures, iii. 488.
- Holy Scriptures*, the duty of circulating, iii. 459, 480.
- Holy Spirit*, the special work of, ii. 513; communications of, 585; agency of, essential to salvation, 649, 712; in regeneration and sanctification, 687.
- Home* the source of morality to children, i. 381.
- Home Education*, Dr. Lindsley's views of, i. 40; the economy of, 136; its great importance, 144; the best policy for Tennessee, 220; the custom of undervaluing, iii. 603.
- Home Products* ought to be protected by a tariff, iii. 379.
- HOMER, his characteristic of man, iii. 96.
- Honest Clergy*, their influence for time and eternity, ii. 63, 64.
- Honest Man*, the true king of men, iii. 270; in office, must be dealt with as if a rogue, 325.
- Honours and Rewards*, the effect of, i. 46.
- HOOK, DR., quoted on episcopal claims, iii. 410.
- HOOKER, RICHARD, the Judicious, quoted, iii. 402; his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, 403; why written, 413; no advocate of Puseyite views, 412; design of his treatise, 413; his doctrine of church power, 413; in what sense called "judicious," 413.
- Hopeless Condition* of those who neglect the gospel, ii. 701.
- HORACE, the Roman poet, on man's primeval condition, ii. 86, 554.
- Horrid Robbery*, article on, iii. 643.
- Horrors* of drunkenness depicted, iii. 522.
- Horse-Racing*, the worst species of gambling, i. 501; views of the sages of Christendom on, ii. 314.
- HORSLEY, BISHOP, advice of, to those who denounce Calvinism, ii. 359.
- Horticulture*, man's first employment in Eden, iii. 98; never the occupation of savages, 98.
- Hostility* to theological seminaries, its source, ii. 55.
- House of Commons*, British, why omnipotent, iii. 329.
- House of Lords*, the British, iii. 285.
- HOWELL, JAMES, letter of, to Sir E. Knight, iii. 218.
- HOYTE, REV. DR. J. W., Professor of Mental and Moral Science in University of Nashville, i. 15.
- Human Ability* unquestionable, ii. 673.
- Human Conduct*, right principles of, iii. 488.
- Human Depravity*, considered, ii. 474; its remedy, a sermon on, 497; declared in Scripture, 500; proved by history, 508; proved by universal experience, 510.
- Human Faculties*, the boundary of the, ii. 421.
- Human Family*, original condition of, iii. 81, 112.
- Human Ignorance* never employed as a Divine agent, i. 444.
- Human Inability* considered, ii. 687.
- Human Knowledge* largely derived from testimony, ii. 676, 677.
- Human Laws*, their injustice to woman, iii. 490.
- Human Learning* more needed than ignorance, iii. 434.
- Human Liberty*, its obligations to classical learning, i. 138, 139.
- Human Nature*, as depicted in the Bible, ii. 505; unregenerate, described, 711; whence degraded and how restored, iii. 94.
- Human Philosophy* a poor teacher for the ills of life, ii. 454.
- Human Race*, its destitution of saving knowledge, iii. 473.

- Human Reason* insufficient to discover moral truth, ii. 422.
- Human Sacrifices* not tolerated on a plea of conscience, iii. 426.
- Human Systems* of virtue, insufficient, ii. 133; their perversion of the gospel, iii. 202; tendency to produce rival sects, 205.
- Humanity* in war a virtue of Washington's character, iii. 250.
- HUME, DAVID, confessions of, i. 306; his views on tolerating sectaries, iii. 211; as a philosopher, 180.
- HUME and GIBBON, dangerous doctrines of, ii. 235.
- Hundred Years*, events of the past, not easily grouped, iii. 235.
- Hunting*, the characteristic of a savage state, iii. 98; not the original occupation of man, 98.
- HUSS, JOHN, referred to, iii. 430.
- Hypothesis* of a primeval savage state, refuted, iii. 83, 113; the received, a stumbling-block to the learned, 184.
- I
- Iceland*, its university education, i. 418; mental cultivation of the people of, 517; a model of popular education, 647.
- Idolatry* of genius and learning condemned, i. 164.
- Ignorance*, the parent of superstition and oppression, i. 73; losses caused by, 439; its baneful influence on society, 440; its prevalence among our people, 468; the source of skepticism, 548; of the Bible, a source of error, 166; not allowed by God in his ministers under any dispensation, ii. 42; cannot be pleaded as an excuse for transgression, 191; often assumes the garb of sanctity, 272; often the cause of popular revolutions in Europe, iii. 240, 241.
- Ills* of human life, their only remedy in the gospel, iii. 491.
- Illustrious Names* of Anglo-American history, iii. 231.
- IMMANUEL, his blood the price of salvation, ii. 706.
- Immortality* of the soul rests on Divine revelation, ii. 696, 697.
- Impatience* of control a characteristic vice of our age, i. 114.
- Impenitent Sinners* entreated and warned, ii. 490.
- Imperfect Rights* must depend on the conscience, iii. 487.
- Import Duties* for protection, adopted by all commercial nations, iii. 388.
- Impossibility* of a primeval savage state demonstrated, iii. 85.
- Improvement*, intellectual and moral, in America, i. 210; in schools and colleges, 520; of time, a sermon by Dr. Lindsley, ii. 205; of the negro race in America, iii. 578, 580.
- Inability* of the sinner no excuse for rejecting the gospel, ii. 529.
- Inaugural Address* of Dr. Lindsley, at Nashville, as President, i. 65; at New Albany, as Professor, iii. 399.
- Incarnation* of Christ, in what sense a mystery, ii. 641.
- Income* of the principal American colleges, i. 216.
- Inconsistencies*, of those who neglect religion, ii. 403; under the garb of democracy, iii. 342.
- Inconsistency*, of those who condemn Christians, ii. 192; of character, described, 259.
- Inconsistent Conduct* in professors of religion, ii. 539, 540.
- Incorporation* of a United States bank questioned at first, iii. 335.
- Incredulity* of the moderns respecting the ancients, its origin, iii. 184.
- Independence*, American, secured the separation of church and state, iii. 422; not to be confounded with liberty, 311; pecuniary, commended to young men, i. 271.
- Independent Judiciary* suggested for Presbyterian Church courts, iii. 442.
- Independents*, few of the old Puritan stock extant, iii. 431.
- Indiana*, facts respecting the banking system of, iii. 588.
- Indians*, American, extermination of, ii. 311; civilized only by Christian missionaries, iii. 117; why so distinct from all other races, 155; descendants of Ham, and under the curse, 162; cannot be descended from the lost tribes of Israel, 163; probably descended from Ham, 164.
- Indian Chief* of the Delawares, his view of Christianity, ii. 384.
- Indian Tribes*, unjust treatment of, ii. 311.
- Indolence* in youth reproved, ii. 240.
- Indulgence* in pleasure the ruin of young men, ii. 172.
- Industry*, necessary to insure success in life, i. 202; essential to all high attainments, ii. 177; preserves mental and bodily vigour, 179; a duty incumbent on all, 237; necessary to learning and usefulness, i. 619; should not be taxed in a tariff, iii. 392.
- Infaney*, much learned in the period of, i. 129.
- Infant Schools*, their value, i. 130.
- Inferior Races*, in contact with superior, the law of, iii. 583.
- Infidel*, the young, described, ii. 152.
- Infidel Christianity* the only dangerous Christianity, iii. 495.
- Infidel Philosophy* unable to solve the problems of history, ii. 423.

- Infidel Politicians* dangerous when leagued with ecclesiastics, iii. 495.
- Infidel Theories* of creation, origin and fallacy of, ii. 695.
- Infidelity*, intolerant spirit and other evils of, i. 317; much covert, still in Christendom, ii. 45; masked under Unitarianism, 77; its objections repeatedly refuted, 484; under the Christian name in New England, 713; its prevalence in parts of Virginia, 714; why it assumes the garb of Christianity, iii. 494; malignant types of, 496; its intolerant spirit, 498.
- Infidels*, propose no substitute for the Bible, ii. 109; compared to the sons-in-law of Lot, 483; not to be treated unevilly, iii. 531.
- Infinite*, a fallacious and objectionable term in argument, ii. 691.
- Influence*, of fashion, potent and destructive, i. 187; social, how obtained, 371; of one bad example on youth, ii. 285; of climate, on varieties of the human family, iii. 175; moral and religious, needed in all human laws, 485.
- Ingratitude* to public benefactors frequent, ii. 231.
- Inhabitants* of Northern America and Europe, their resemblance, iii. 173.
- Inheritance*, American, in the triumphs of England, iii. 231.
- Iniquity* of the licensed sale of strong drink, iii. 537.
- Injuries and Wrongs* of woman without the Bible, iii. 490.
- Innocence* of man nowhere realized in history, ii. 509.
- Innovation* not always improvement, i. 300.
- Inordinate Pursuit of Wealth* condemned in Scripture, iii. 589.
- Inquisition*, the spirit of, not extinct, ii. 315.
- Insensibility* of men to the warnings of the gospel, ii. 290.
- Inspiration* of Scripture, three degrees of, ii. 666; lowest degree of, involves the highest, 667.
- Instability* the bane of our national policy, iii. 346.
- Installation* of Rev. Dr. Edgar at Nashville, ii. 303.
- Institutions* of religion, their influence, ii. 117; their close connection with the State, iii. 420, 545.
- Instruction*, necessary for the mind, i. 70; popular, where to be found, 137; the State doctrine of, towards Senators in Congress, denied, iii. 306, 307.
- Intellectual Power* more than a match for brute force, iii. 237.
- Intellectual Pursuits* salutary to body and mind, i. 456.
- Intellectual Training* imperfect without morals and religion, i. 647.
- Intelligence and Virtue*, found under absolute monarchies in Europe, iii. 240; essential to a republic, 257.
- Intemperance*, estimate of its evils, i. 181; its victims, 182; remedies for, suggested, 183; influence of fashion in sustaining, 184; its dangers to the young, 185; its fearful effects, 270, 293; its peculiar disadvantages to the young, ii. 169, 171; should be rooted out of the church, 314; annual cost of, iii. 491; its evils long seen and deplored by good men, 506; its extent in our country, 507; its ruin to society, 508; its cure the greatest discovery of our age, 509; total abstinence the only remedy, 510; a despotic foe to man, 513; diseases from, frightful, 518, 520; its burdens and losses, 525; kept up by moderate drinking, 533.
- Intercourse* between churches, conditions of, iii. 453, 455.
- Internal Improvements*, constitutionality of, iii. 338, 339.
- Intolerance*, of the opponents of church creeds, ii. 345; of all established churches, 318.
- Intoxication* unfrequent in wine-countries, iii. 530.
- Invention and Discovery*, progress of, in the last century, iii. 238.
- Inventors and Discoverers*, eminent, referred to, ii. 418.
- Invitations* of the gospel reasonable and urgent, ii. 406.
- Ireland*, temperance society in, iii. 540.
- IRENÆUS and other fathers referred to, ii. 46.
- Iron*, unknown to savages, iii. 99; its early use disproves a primeval savage state, 99; in use before the Deluge, 118.
- Irregulars* in college seldom learn anything, i. 388.
- Irresponsible Power* of the President of the United States, iii. 348.
- ISAAC, the offering of, in sacrifice, explained and vindicated, ii. 684.
- ISAIAH quoted on the ancient supremacy of Egypt, iii. 142.
- Islands*, probable chain of, between Africa and America, iii. 154, 159.
- Israelites* commissioned to destroy the Canaanites, ii. 683.
- Italian Nobleman*, account of, used for illustration, ii. 173.

J

- JACKSON, DR. CHARLES, his letter on Dr. Troost, i. 638.
- JACKSON, GENERAL ANDREW, referred to, i. 157, 594, iii. 278.
- JACOB and ESAU, objections in reference to their case, ii. 683.

- JACOBUS, DR. M. W., his minute on the death of Dr. Lindsley, iii. 68.
- JACOTOT, his system of instruction, i. 514.
- Jails*, the worst form of prisons, i. 252; would not be needed if the Bible had full sway, iii. 483.
- JAMES THE FIRST, the British Solomon, iii. 407; his policy of "no bishop, no king," 407; wished to be pope as well as king, 407.
- Japan*, country of, used in illustration of mysteries in the Bible, ii. 679.
- Jardin des Plantes*, at Paris, described, i. 409.
- JARDINE and JACOTOT, and other writers on education, i. 521.
- JAY, his treaty ratified by a majority of one, iii. 349.
- JEFFERSON, THOMAS, his efforts to establish a university, i. 142; his opinion on simplifying the laws, 297; his testimony to the ethics of Christianity, 313; his views on Virginia primary schools, 480; his Notes on Virginia quoted, ii. 374; his remarks on Calvinism and Presbyterians, 355; his political opinions, iii. 280; his policy of a liberal construction of the Constitution, 332-334; founder of the Democratic and States' Rights party, 332; difference of his views when in and out of office, 332; strict constructionist in theory only, 333; his policy liberal and safe, 333; his gunboat system, 334, 337; his purchase of Louisiana, 336; national road under his administration, 339; held to the one-term Presidency in theory, 345; his opinions and practices cited, 350, 351; his views on negro slavery, 669, 671.
- JENNINGS, DR. OBADIAH, referred to, ii. 27.
- JEROBOAM, a liberal constructionist of Jewish law, iii. 343.
- JEROME of Prague referred to, iii. 430.
- JESUS CHRIST, the only mediator, ii. 126; his death a stupendous fact, 680; his pure system of morality, 681, 683; his eternal Sonship, 692, 693; died to satisfy the demands of the Divine law, 704; the great theme of all preaching, iii. 224; only Redeemer and friend of the poor, 489; disclaimed all worldly power, 494.
- Jews*, treatment of the, ii. 312; their sin in rejecting the Messiah, 701; their ancient privileges, 701; a standing monument of God's judgments, 702; should not be prevented from becoming Christians, iii. 426; when converted, generally become preachers of Christ, 428; their exaltation of woman, 469; the modern, chiefly money-lenders, 545; their oppressions by Christians, ii. 312.
- JONES, SIR WILLIAM, referred to, iii. 116; opinions of, cited, 128, 191.
- JONES, REV. WILLIAM, letter to Catcott, quoted, iii. 158.
- JOHNSON, DR. SAMUEL, his opinion on speech as an invention, iii. 95, 96; his definition of patriotism, 553.
- JOHNSTONE, SIR ARCHIBALD, in the Westminster Assembly, iii. 432.
- JORTIN quoted on religious persecution, iii. 212.
- JOSEPH, honoured in his Egyptian wife, iii. 140; why connected with the priestly order, 140.
- JOSEPHUS, his statement as to Jews slain by the Romans, iii. 180.
- Journals*, secret, of the Convention to form our Constitution, iii. 317; literary, religious, and scientific, their party politics, 572.
- Joys* of life, true estimate of their value, ii. 217, 218.
- JUDAS ISCARIOT a warning to nominal Christians, ii. 71, iii. 481.
- Judicial Functions* of the Presbyterian General Assembly need remodelling, iii. 440-442.
- Judiciary*, its relation to the other branches of government, iii. 341; how to secure a good one, 290.
- Judges*, their removal by the President, iii. 351.
- Judgment*, the right of private, as held by Protestants, iii. 451.
- Jurisprudence*, the Anglo-American, needs improvement, i. 296; influence of the Bible on systems of, iii. 485.
- JUSSIEU and others referred to, i. 409.
- Justice*, expense of the administration of, i. 295; of the American Revolution, admitted by all men, iii. 246.
- Justice and Mercy*, awful exhibition of, ii. 618.
- Justification* by faith, held as essential truth by all the Reformers, ii. 348; fully taught in Scripture, 687, 688; Romish and Protestant views of, 689.

K

- KENNICOTT and other Bible students, i. 446.
- KENT, CHANCELLOR, his views of the Constitution modified, iii. 318; quotations from, 320, 323, 342.
- KEPLER and other astronomers, their discoveries confirm the Bible, i. 446.
- KING ALFRED, his liberal views of education, i. 85.
- KING DAVID, character of, objected to by cavillers, ii. 683.
- KING, HON. RUFUS, his opinion cited, iii. 352.
- King* of England, a privileged creditor, iii. 320; the fountain of law and honour, 320.
- King of Terrors*, the victims of, ii. 216.

- Kingcraft* in Scotland in the reign of James, iii. 407.
- Kingdom of God*, essentially spiritual, ii. 317; promoted by the downfall of other kingdoms, 451; its meaning in Scripture, 633; not of this world, iii. 494; of the Pharaohs, a highly civilized state, 137; fit arena for the display of Jehovah's power, 138.
- Kings*, the divine right of, ii. 336.
- KIRKPATRICK, REV. JACOB, D. D., referred to, iii. 13.
- KITTO, DR. JOHN, reference to Dr. Lindsley in his *Cyclopedia*, i. 32.
- KLAPROTH, his letter to Alexander Humboldt, iii. 169.
- Knaves and Hypocrites*, cannot be kept out of any church, iii. 482; how they contrive to pass for honest men, 487.
- Knowledge*, the power of, illustrated in the life of Dr. Lindsley, i. 55; how retained, transmitted, and advanced, 71; the diffusion of, in ancient Greece and Rome, 72; the whole circle of, unattainable in this life, 107; to be sought as long as we live, 122; its elevating influence on all classes, 198; the right of every human being to, 199; indispensable to the minister of the gospel, 443; necessary to virtue in a community, 458; our duty to increase it, 458; its place in the Christian ministry, ii. 41, 42, 614; to what it invites us, 238; the time for gaining, 239; an indestructible inheritance to a child, 239; every kind of, worthy of cultivation, 240; condemned only by the ignorant, 241; of the world, its proper value, 243; where best acquired, 244; not hereditary, but obtained by labour, 416; of revelation, subject to the conditions of all other knowledge, 425; speculative, the insufficiency of, 522; of gospel truth, infinitely precious, 654; how most easily augmented, iii. 115; formerly taxed in England, 391; should be sought by farmers and mechanics, 395; of the American continent, once possessed by the ancients, 159.
- KNOX, JOHN, like Milton, an example for students, ii. 239.
- KOSCIUSKO and other Polish generals of the Revolution, i. 140.
- L
- Labour*, essential to success in life, i. 177; mental, indispensable to high attainments, iii. 115; industrial, needs a market for its products, 382; amount of, in ancient colossal works, 131.
- Labouring Classes*, amusements of, i. 83; should have a better education, 225; their leisure hours often wasted when they might be improved. 227; their original and rightful position in society, 269.
- Ladies*, appealed to for the Bible, iii. 470, 490; would be slaves without its influence, 471; never appealed to in vain for the suffering, 471; their powerful aid in the temperance cause, 541.
- LAFAYETTE, GENERAL, referred to, i. 140; his agency in the French Revolution, 451; on the liberties of America, 533; quotation from, iii. 555.
- LAMB OF GOD needed to atone for sin, ii. 720.
- Lancasterian System* of education, i. 134.
- Land*, inexpediency of taxing, i. 489; vast tract of, submerged in the Atlantic, iii. 159, 161; revenue from, to the priesthood in ancient Egypt, 139; of distillers and drunkards, described, 508; of steady habits, youth ruined in, 521.
- Land Tax*, when objectionable, iii. 392; beneficial in England, 393.
- LANG, REV. DR., his work referred to, iii. 162.
- Language*, the result of imitation, iii. 82; its origin from God, 95; unity of the antediluvian, favourable to a high state of civilization, 101; diversity of, on the plains of Shinar, caused by miracle, 101.
- Large Libraries* not needed by youth in college, i. 401.
- Large Cities* the best for institutions of learning, i. 258.
- Largest Liberty*, the principle of, violated by democracies, iii. 325.
- Last Sabbath* of the year, its solemn lessons pointed out, ii. 207.
- Laudation* of every thing American condemned, iii. 312.
- LAVOISIER and other philosophers referred to, ii. 418.
- Law of honour*, considered, i. 187; the crimes it tolerates, 188; no protection to women, iii. 490.
- Law and Equity*, our systems of, expensive, i. 222; the English system of, characterized, 223; its cumbersome machinery and inequalities, 296; unconstitutional remedies for, iii. 310; described as a science, 40; construction of, 297.
- Law and Gospel*, distinction between, ii. 597.
- Law*, of God, its authority and extent, ii. 189; of Christ, on temperance, iii. 538; binding on all men, 539; of the Christian Sabbath, what it forbids, ii. 89, 91; what it requires, 93; not fulfilled by outward acts alone, 101.
- Laws*, of God, reach the heart and conscience, iii. 488; of man, fail to restrain vice without the Bible, 485; reach only the overt action, 486; cannot inspire virtuous principles, 487; their

- defects supplied by the Bible, 488; have never sufficiently protected woman, 490; the Alien and Sedition, of our country, 350; the existing, on slavery, harsh and cruel, 581; several, suggested for its peaceful removal, 572, 573.
- Lawful*, proper application of the term, ii. 191.
- Lawgivers* among the Greeks, whence their wisdom, iii. 148.
- Lawyers*, political guides of the people, i. 349; have too much power, 350; their number and training in Tennessee, 222; Dr. Lindsley's opinion of, 223; two kinds of, 224.
- Lawyers and Parsons*, of the ordinary stamp, i. 347; do not need the stimulus of ardent spirits, iii. 527; with doctors and politicians, created by existing evils, 268.
- LAZARUS, the resurrection of, referred to, ii. 669.
- Learned Men*, their influence on society, i. 74; their titles of nobility in Europe, 425; their waste of ingenuity on groundless theories, iii. 151.
- Learned Ministry*, a plea for, ii. 33; its necessity shown from history, 45-47; demanded by the heresies of the times, 78, 79.
- Learning*, usefulness of all, i. 41; benefits of, partially enjoyed, 71; influence of, in Egypt and Chaldea, 71; effects of the Reformation on, 72; influence and effects of, 74; a heresy in regard to, 80; prejudices against, 84; evidence of its beneficial tendency, 139; demand for, increases with the supply, 135; colonial pioneers in the cause of, 211; evil effects of, when restricted to a few, 334; encourages the arts of peace, 334; often denounced by the rich, 395; lessons from history on its perversion, 334; no bar to the highest civil office in New England, 426; much of every kind needed in the study of the Bible, 446; a little better than none, 519; not inherited, ii. 70; popular fallacies about, 44; friendly to religion, 47; of the early Christian fathers, 45, 46; no royal road to, iii. 115; demanded in the study of the Scriptures, 206.
- Lectures* of Dr. Lindsley, on Greek literature, iii. 18, 28, 29; on political science, 36; on the arts and science of the ancients, 18-28; in the College of New Jersey, 81; on popular education, i. 463.
- Lectures*, Blair's, on Rhetoric and Belles-Lettres, quoted, iii. 97.
- Left-handed Civility* between churches described, iii. 454.
- Legal Equality* of all religious sects, i. 322.
- Legislation*, influence of, on the people, i. 292; excessive and vicious, 294; for and against education, effect of, 646; its injurious influence in Tennessee, 647; solemn character of, iii. 284; not to be intrusted to young men, 285; its cost to the people, 289; excessive, may do much harm, 354; its immense power for weal or woe, 356; proper subjects for, 357; American, on the African race, very bad, 578.
- Legislative Instruction*, the right of, discussed, iii. 304.
- Legislators*, their pay in different States, iii. 289; of Tennessee, suggestions to, respecting a University, i. 412.
- Legislature* of Tennessee, its course towards schools and colleges, i. 351.
- Legislatures*, character of American, iii. 287; omnipotence of, 288; anomaly in, 289; State and National, not antagonistic, 308.
- Legitimate Province* of the preacher, ii. 64.
- Liberal Education*, its claims advocated, i. 81, 573; its influence on all classes, 82.
- Liberal Man*, the reward of, iii. 535; Scripture testimony to, 476.
- Liberal Sentiments* of Dr. Lindsley as a Presbyterian, i. 53, ii. 23, 368, iii. 315, 455.
- Liberality*, Christian, required of all men, iii. 481; never regretted in the hour of death, 502.
- Liberia*, in Africa, the only republic like our own, iii. 563.
- Liberty*, as understood by the American fathers, i. 76; education the safeguard of, 75; by whom advocated and promoted, 143; the university the ally of, 450; may be enjoyed under a monarchy, iii. 312; nowhere possessed without the Bible, 467; not enjoyed by woman in the Grecian and Roman republics, 468; its progress measured by the progress of the gospel, 469; ultimate triumph of, secured by religious knowledge, 666.
- Liberty* of conscience, the largest allowed in the Presbyterian Church, ii. 360; invaded by the opposers of creeds, 345; does not give one sect preference over another, iii. 426.
- Liberty and Union*, the sentiment of, i. 357.
- Liberty or Death*, why the motto of the American Revolution, iii. 247.
- Library*, of the Nashville University, i. 268; ministerial and congregational, how procured, ii. 37.
- Libraries*, of Europe and America, i. 406; of Harvard and Yale, 417.
- Licence System*, its history curious and instructive, iii. 391; taverns and groceries under, 536.
- Life*, human, its brevity and importance, ii. 159-161; how to make the most of,

- 162; shortened by licentious indulgence, 163; how hazarded and lost, 181; should be a constant preparation for eternity, 186; often wasted in accumulating money, 213; a state of discipline and trial, 459; of usefulness, commended to young men, i. 269.
- Life and Death*, the mysterious nature of, ii. 672.
- Life-Work*, its essential conditions, i. 623.
- Light*, of nature, an inadequate guide, ii. 188; of modern civilization, a barrier against the return of barbarism, iii. 237.
- Light Essays* of Dr. Lindsley for the newspapers, iii. 602.
- LIGHTFOOT, DR. JOHN, an Erastian member of the Westminster Assembly, iii. 432.
- LINCOLN, GOVERNOR, of Massachusetts, on schools, i. 473.
- LINNÆUS and BUFFON referred to, ii. 418.
- LINDSLEY, ADRIAN VAN SINDEREN, eldest son of Dr. Lindsley, a lawyer, i. 15, 30.
- LINDSLEY, DR. JOHN BERRIEN, minister and chancellor of the university, i. 15, 29.
- LINDSLEY, DR. NATHANIEL LAWRENCE, professor and author, i. 15, 30.
- LINDSLEY, MRS. MARGARET ELIZABETH, wife of Dr. Lindsley, i. 13; portraiture of her character, iii. 64-66.
- LINDSLEY, MARGARET, daughter of Dr. Lindsley, her marriage, i. 15.
- LINDSLEY, ELIZA BERRIEN, daughter of Dr. Lindsley, her marriage, i. 15.
- LINDSLEY, PHILIP, JR., a child, his early death, iii. 62; sketch of his life and character, 63.
- LINDSLEY, PHILIP, D. D., brief outline of his life, i. 12; biographical account of, iii. 9; birthplace and early studies, 10; recollections of his mother, 11; his first teachers, 12; first attempts at teaching, 13; letter to Rev. P. E. Stevenson, 13; classmates, graduation, and tutorship, 14; studies and attainments, 15; his standing as Professor in Princeton, 16; plea for the theological seminary, 17; lectures and works for the press, 18; commanding influence in college, 19; personal appearance and style of preaching at Princeton, 21; theological studies, i. 12; Doctorate of Divinity conferred, 13; originality and popularity as a preacher, iii. 22; great influence as a preacher and educator, 22; Vice-President and President elect of Nassau Hall, i. 13, iii. 23; many overtures from colleges declined, iii. 23; visit to Nashville, and letters to the Trustees of Cumberland College, 24; his motives for accepting the Presidency of that institution, 25; resignation at Princeton, 26; arrival and inauguration at Nashville, 27; his manner of conferring degrees, 27; sketch of his educational labours, i. 12; member of the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries, 13; chief work of his life at Nashville, 15; his great reputation as a teacher, 16; his perseverance at Nashville, 17; appointments declined by him, 18; first baccalaureate, 19; large plans for a university, 20-22; his views of American colleges, 21; his ardent zeal in the cause of education, 23; his unsectarian character, 24; noble vindications of learning, 25-27; disappointments and trials in his work, 28; his confidence of ultimate success, 29, 30; his sons, practical instructors, 30; spoken and published addresses, 31; contributions of learned articles for the press, 32; his tracts on education, 34; his associates and co-labourers at Nashville, 34, 57; the master-spirit of all educational movements in Tennessee, 34; his opinions as an educator, 35; his views of normal schools and the teaching office, 36; views of universal education, 37; views on common schools, 38, 39; his views on home education, 40; pleads for the ancient classics as essential in education, 42; his opinion of penitentiaries, 45; views on college honours and rewards, 46; views on religion and the study of the Bible as a part of education, 48-51; liberal views of a college as Christian but not sectarian, 51, 52; opinion on denominational schools, 52; stamp of his character as a Presbyterian, 53; results and influences of his life as an educator, 53; the number and character of his pupils, 54; his influence on the city of Nashville, 56; influence throughout the Southwest, 55; worthy of a public monument, 60; his feelings on being inaugurated, 117; historical and archaeological studies, iii. 27-29; extent and range of his reading, 30-36; opinions respecting various authors, 31, 32; lectures on political economy and government, 36; a careful student of orthography, 640; of political economy, 648; his method of preparing materials for lectures, 545; his habit of writing for the newspapers, 42, 602; his earlier and later views on slavery, 574, 663; cast of his mind, 36; his statesmanship, 37; his position as to party politics, 37; method of teaching in the lecture-room, 37; his discourse on American Democracy, 38; his pupils in political science, 38; his extemporaneous discourses, 39; the solid character of his lectures and scholarship, 39; his opinions on the learned professions, farmers, and mechanics, 39; on collegiate doctorates,

- 41; efforts in behalf of popular education and common schools, 42; his powers of wit and sarcasm, 43; speeches in the General Assembly, 43; outline of his character as a preacher, ii. 7; his sermons chiefly educational, 8; his earnestness and energy, 9; preached only when well prepared, 10; his appearance in the pulpit, 10; peculiar style of delivery, 11, 12; characteristics of his diction, 12, 13; a master of the art of expression, 14; classic elegance of all his writings, 14; practical character of his preaching, 15; avoidance of controversial themes, 16; his farewell sermon at Princeton, 16; sermon on the mysteries of God, described, 18; symmetry and moderation in his preaching, 18; great objects of his preaching, 19; illustration of his wise counsels, 20, 21; his large charity, 23; a Presbyterian, but not a bigot, 23, 24, 346; his sphere of labour, 373; his fearless denunciations of sin and vice, 23; his liberal views of church government, 24; his Plea for Princeton Seminary described, 24-26; his zeal for ministerial education, 26, 27; his project of a theological seminary at Nashville, 27; why he did not preach frequently, 28; the chief elements of his power, 29; his ancestry and family connections, iii. 43; his ecclesiastical position, 44; his adherence to Presbyterian doctrine and order, 45; attendance on church courts, 45, 46; Moderator of the General Assembly of 1834, and member of others, 46; letter to Dr. Brown on this subject one of his last, 47, 49; his impartiality and conservatism, 49; removal from Nashville and sundering of ties, 49, 50; sum of his labours at Nashville, 51; proof of their success, 52; position at New Albany, and influence as Professor there, 52; inauguration and lectures in the theological seminary, 53; last service as President of Nashville University, 52; resignation of his office at New Albany, 53; testimonial of his colleague, Dr. Stuart, 53; his great conversational powers, 56; his stores of learning, 54; his catholic and genial spirit, 55; his courtesy and gentlemanly bearing, 59; his piety and spirituality, 57; his domestic and social relations, 58; home his Eden, 59; long-cherished filial affections, 60; reminiscences of his mother, 60, 61; family bereavements, 62; tribute to the memory of a son, 62, 63; loss of Mrs. Lindsley, 64; touching portraiture of her character, 64, 65; letter to his children in affliction, 66; memorials of his religious character, 67; last attendance on the General Assembly, 67; last illness, and death, at Nashville, i. 14, iii. 67; his sublime and peaceful end, i. 61, 62; tributes of respect at his death, iii. 67; action of the General Assembly, 68; minute adopted by that body, 69; funeral solemnities, 70; action of the Board of Trustees and alumni of the university, 71, 72; tributes from the press, and estimates of his genius, 73-75; testimony of Dr. Van Rensselaer to his exalted piety and life of usefulness, 76; his power as a writer and man of letters, 74; eminent ability and success as an educator, 75; other tributes and memorials, 77, 78.
- Lines* quoted from Longfellow, i. 62.
- Lion*, democratic, Dorr of Rhode Island the greatest, of the day, iii. 353.
- Liquors*, intoxicating, their former universal use, iii. 509; unnecessary as a stimulus, 527; prohibited by temperance societies, 529; licensed sale of, 391; distilled and fermented, 529; difference in their use, 534; amount consumed by our people, and pauperism caused by, i. 182.
- Literature*, influence of, i. 344; American, should be cultivated, 355; relations of English and American, 355.
- Literature and Science*, ameliorating influence of, i. 84.
- Literary Men* few in our wealthy classes, i. 394.
- Literary Society* compared with fashionable, i. 432.
- Literary Taste* among the poor, effects of, i. 84.
- Living* beyond one's income dangerous to virtue, i. 291.
- Locality* of Nashville described, i. 57-59, 379.
- LOCKE, JOHN, illustration of his docility, iii. 207; estimate of learning in his dying hours, i. 276.
- Logic*, odious epithets often pass for, iii. 124; false, employed by the opposers of a protective tariff, 380; inconsistent, on the subject of slavery, 667.
- Lollards* referred to, iii. 430.
- Longevity*, how promoted, ii. 169; of the antediluvians, favourable to the progress of art and science, iii. 100.
- Long Constitutions* generally bad in proportion to their length, iii. 295.
- Long Life* desirable and attainable, ii. 180.
- Long Presidency* of Dr. Lindsley at Nashville, iii. 75.
- LONGWORTH, NICHOLAS, of Cincinnati, referred to, iii. 597.
- Looker-on in Venice*, iii. 309.
- LORD MONBODDO, fallacy of his reasoning on man, iii. 91.
- LORD TEMPLE, his case illustrates royal interference in legislation, iii. 350.

- Lords of Creation* cannot check female liberality, iii. 471.
- Lord's Supper*, nature and design of the institution, ii. 537; its objects, 538; emblems of, 549.
- Lordly Churchism* described, ii. 367.
- Loss*, of confidence in our banks, to what attributable, iii. 360; of money, in ardent spirits, 524; of time, to be well considered, ii. 212; by others, a cruel robbery of our treasure, iii. 645.
- Losses*, immense, under our banking system, iii. 362.
- Lost Tribes of Israel* cannot be the American Indians, iii. 163.
- Lor* in Sodom, the character of, ii. 470.
- Louisiana*, purchase of, by Mr. Jefferson, iii. 333, 336, 350.
- Louisville Journal*, eommendatory article on Dr. Lindsley, iii. 77.
- Love*, of country, American, described, i. 352; of God, what it implies and requires, ii. 386; of gold, an argument against benevolence, 43; of the world, the great cause of unbelief, 489.
- Lower Orders* of people, their condition in Christendom, iii. 133.
- LUCIAN, his testimony as to the fate of Nineveh and Babylon, iii. 107.
- LUCRETIVS quoted on man's primeval savage state, iii. 85, 86.
- LUTHER, MARTIN, his embittered contests with Calvin, iii. 208; quoted, to illustrate the power of prejudice, 214; his answer to Spalatinus on the Bible, 220; referred to, 430; a model in the pursuit of learning, ii. 239; an example, like Cromwell, of decision of character, 254; his peculiar views on the Eucharist, 347; on all other points, Calvinistic, 348; charity of his compcers, 369.
- Lutheran Churches* of Denmark and Germany, iii. 429.
- Luxuries*, rather than necessaries, to be taxed, iii. 377.
- LYELL and other geologists referred to, i. 446.
- Lynch Law* repudiated and condemned, i. 510.
- M
- MACKNIGHT, REV. DR., his labours, ii. 179; injured by ceasing from his studies, 179.
- MACLEAN, REV. DR. JOHN, his opinion of Dr. Lindsley, i. 16.
- MACLURE, WILLIAM, anecdote of, i. 603.
- MADAME ROLAND, her exclamation on liberty, iii. 571.
- MADISON, PRESIDENT JAMES, opinions as to the powers of the Constitution, iii. 352; papers of, 317, 318, 351.
- Magical Power* of mere party names, iii. 223.
- Magna Charta*, American share in its immunities, iii. 321.
- Maine*, the school system in the State of, i. 502.
- MAITLAND, LORD JOHN, in the Westminster Assembly of Divines, iii. 432.
- Majorities*, governing, may become dangerous to liberty, iii. 256; in what sense they govern, 303; should decide all questions in Congress, 344, 349.
- Mala Prohibita* distinguished from *mala in se*, ii. 321.
- Malays and Monguls* probably descendants of Ham, iii. 186.
- Malthusian Heresy* disproved by the populousness of China, iii. 183.
- Mammon*, the votaries of, described, iii. 475.
- Mammon-loving Christians* described, ii. 43, 44.
- Man*, a moral and intellectual being, i. 83; the creature of education, 65; a religious being, 165; in his primitive state, civilized and educated, 32, 66; prone to degeneracy, 69; not always disposed to cultivate his faculties, 70; to what extent the creature of circumstances, 128; his first lesson to think for himself, 200; not satisfied with earthly things, ii. 182; his chief end as an heir of immortality, 196; made for religion, 234; his character drawn in the Bible, 244; his inability and depravity, 389; his total depravity a doctrine of Scripture, 473, 498; apostasy proved by the facts of history, 503; unable to regenerate himself, 513; how endowed and distinguished, 663; means and sources of his knowledge, 664; able to decide on the evidences of a divine revelation, 665; allowed to judge of facts, 665; appealed to as a free agent by his Maker, 679; his helpless and perishing condition as a sinner, 68, 685; restored to the image of God by the gospel, 706; his guilt and doom when a tempter of the young, 286; in what state created, iii. 98, 113, 151; civilized from the beginning, 83, 112, 151; a speaking animal, 95, 96; has always been a civilized being, 83, 113.
- Man*, according to Lord Monboddo, allied to the simian tribes, iii. 90; as God's image, could not have been created in a savage state, 84, 112; found in a civilized state from Eden to the dispersion at Babel, 111, 113; never a monkey or a quadruped, 96; his occupation in Eden inconsistent with a savage state, 97; in infancy, dependent on others for education, 82, 114; accountable for his religion only to a heart-searching tribunal, 212; defined as a tool-making animal, 266; his constant injustice to woman, 490; his strength dependent on association, 512; character of the God-fearing, described, 487.

- Mankind*, the original condition of, iii. 81, 113, 151; mass of, governed by their prejudices, 192, 194.
- MANSFIELD, LORD, referred to among self-made men, i. 342, iii. 324; quoted on popularity, 553.
- Manufacture*, of cotton, the home, iii. 384; of ardent spirits, political economy on, 525; unlawfulness of, 535, 536; of wine, suggested for our country, 530; of testimonials for genteel beggars, 610.
- Manufactures*, essential to a country's prosperity, iii. 380; what is essential to make them flourish, 383; essential to independent nationality, 384; those of the North not oppressive to the South, 386; greatly needed in the South, 386; their progress and extension Southward, 387; home, should be protected, 379.
- Manuscript Volumes* of Dr. Lindsley, some burnt, iii. 9, 28, 29.
- Mariner's Compass*, difficulties in the way of its discovery, ii. 417; not unknown to the ancients, iii. 168; kept a secret, 169.
- Markets* for home products the great want of our country, iii. 381, 387.
- Marriage*, in Austria, allowable to those only who can read and write, i. 240; of Joseph in Egypt, its policy, iii. 140; among slaves, 582.
- Martyrdom* not an infallible test of truth and sincerity, ii. 362.
- Martyrs and Pioneers* of truth, their sacrifices, i. 284.
- Martyr Spirit* of the Scotch Presbyterians, iii. 408.
- Mass*, of the people in Europe, nowhere enjoy the elective franchise, iii. 253; in Continental Europe, mostly educated, i. 239; of the American people, must be labourers, iii. 271; of mankind, in all ages and countries, controlled by the few, 134.
- Massachusetts*, annual expenditure for liquors in, i. 182; feeling of her people toward South Carolina, 338; eulogium on, as an educated commonwealth, 426; her system of public education, 473; her school fund, 475; her system impossible for Tennessee, 644; her manufactures not injurious to the South, iii. 386.
- Materials*, rich and full, on the subject of ancient learning, iii. 150; for banking, gold and silver the only legitimate, 549.
- Materialism*, if true, no disproof of the soul's immortality, ii. 696; the doctrine of, contrary to reason and Scripture, 697.
- Matters of Fact* distinguished from Scripture mysteries, ii. 643.
- Maxims*, materials for reflection, article on, iii. 553; among temperance physicians, 519; of wisdom for the young, i. 272.
- Mayflower* referred to, iii. 439.
- Means* of grace, their use necessary to salvation, ii. 526.
- Measures*, of public interest, when constitutional, iii. 335; of the North, at first originated in the South, 570.
- Mechanics*, may claim an illustrious origin, iii. 266; the earliest occupation in Eden, 265.
- Mechanical Arts* essential to social existence, iii. 266.
- Mechanics and Farmers*, influence of, on society, i. 348; true policy for their sons, 348; need education for themselves and their children, iii. 270.
- Mechanics, Farmers, and Schoolmasters*, the three most ancient and useful classes, iii. 265, 266; thrown into the background by an upstart nobility, 267; their common interests, 270.
- Medical Profession*, noble efforts of, in favour of the temperance cause, iii. 517.
- Medical Reforms* of a Paracelsus, i. 599.
- Medical Schools* can succeed only in cities, i. 219; the students of, in France and Germany, 421, 422; thoroughness of their education, 222, 422.
- Meeting-Houses*, why so called, iii. 424.
- Men*, the first of our race, their condition according to the Greek and Latin poets, iii. 93; agreement of, as to ends, while differing about ways and means, 556; cannot set aside the claims of God's law, ii. 190; of genius, examples of, i. 617; obligation of the world to, ii. 419.
- Men*, of learning, in the dark ages, i. 73; not always the friends of liberty, 143; in office, should not be partisans, iii. 303; of science and literature, their character, i. 456; of Seventy-Six, their intellectual and moral character, 209; their mistakes about personal religion, ii. 399, 400; who boast of conscientious scruples, to be suspected, iii. 314; who strain at gnats and swallow camels, 342.
- Men-Pleasers* cannot be the servants of God, ii. 251.
- Mercury* fourteen and eighteen degrees below zero at Nashville in 1831 and 1832, iii. 614, 627.
- Messengers* to be believed on testimony, though from the moon, ii. 677.
- Messiah*, results of his first advent, iii. 460.
- Methodism*, American, lordly power of its bishops, iii. 429.
- Metropolitans*, popish and patriarchal, origin of, iii. 418.
- Mexicans and Peruvians*, their colossal works and state of civilization, iii. 117, 166.
- MICHAELIS and EICHHORN, biblical critics, iii. 180.
- Microscope and Telescope*, revelations of, i. 631.

- Middling Classes*, their interests in education, i. 146.
- Military Companies*, cost to the labouring classes, iii. 598.
- Militia System*, expensive and useless, i. 293, 477, iii. 357; taxes of, i. 476.
- Millennium*, small prospect of its near approach, ii. 80.
- MILLER, DR. SAMUEL, his opinion on the ordination of ruling elders, iii. 445.
- Millions*, of men slaughtered in the wars of the last century, iii. 238; of money, consumed in strong drink, 523; a dead loss to the community, 524.
- MILTIADES and other sufferers at the hands of their country, i. 282.
- MILTON, JOHN, quoted on liberal education, i. 106; effect of his writings, 285; a good schoolmaster, 562.
- Mind*, proper condition of, for acquiring truth, iii. 195.
- Ministers of Christ*, ineligible to civil office in some States, i. 487; hundreds needed, ii. 68; preaching of, popular, 326; proofs of faithfulness in, 655; a public education needed by, 48, 49; their rights as citizens, 61; their usefulness as a profession, 62, 63; their great work, 64; their twofold character and relation, 333; fidelity demanded in, 631; what is implied in being faithful, 643; must preach the mysteries of Christ, 647.
- Ministers*, why faithful as God's stewards, 648; nature of their obligations, 651; should agree to differ, iii. 207; all faithful, successors of the apostles, 409; none able to trace the pedigrees far back, 410; sustain a twofold character, 448; their example as to temperance, 533; of the Presbyterian Church, must adopt its standards, 444; ought to instruct their people on church government, 449.
- Ministry of the gospel*, a learned, needful, ii. 33; must be supported more liberally, 36, 37; what is expected of, 33; can be qualified only by study, 41, 42; an appeal to, 76.
- MIRABEAU quoted, iii. 299.
- Miracles*, of the Bible, addressed to the senses, ii. 667; all matters of fact, 668; differ from all spurious miracles, 668; of philanthropy and mercy, wrought by Christianity, ii. 236.
- Miraculous Facts* of the Bible founded on evidence, ii. 668.
- Miraculous Preservation* seen in the descendants of Israel, iii. 164.
- Misery*, all in the world due to sin, ii. 511; of lost sinners, must be endless, 494.
- Misgovernment* exhibited in our country, iii. 356.
- Mission of Christ to this world*, ii. 593.
- Missionary Aspect* presented by our own country, ii. 67, 68.
- Missions to the heathen* the characteristic of our age, ii. 432.
- Mississippi*, education in the valley of the, i. 213.
- Mobocracy*, the prevalence of, in our country, i. 469.
- Mode*, of the Divine existence, inscrutable to man, ii. 640; of miracles and mysteries, not revealed to us, 670, 671.
- Moderate Use* of ardent spirits fraught with evil, iii. 510, 520.
- Moderatism* in the Church of Scotland, its despotism, iii. 441.
- Modern Persecutor* in a Christian garb described, ii. 270.
- Modern Pharisaism* condemned, i. 323.
- Modern Puseyism*, the spirit of, iii. 410.
- Modern Unitarianism* more dangerous than avowed infidelity, ii. 77.
- Modern Slavery* the sin of Christendom, iii. 669.
- Moderns* slow to do justice to ancient art and science, iii. 169.
- Modesty* the crowning glory of a liberal education, i. 573.
- Moloch*, sacrifices to, in ancient times, ii. 680; of modern intemperance, iii. 582.
- MONBODDO, LORD, his theory of man's primeval state, iii. 89; fallacy of his reasoning, 91.
- Money*, the making of, not condemned by the gospel, ii. 34; how employed for good, 36, 81; people who make, the best members of society, i. 229; parents allow sons too much, 390; aristocracy of, described, 395; the best kind of paper, iii. 372; how created out of a national debt, 373; paper, safer and more convenient than specie, 487; no compensation for loss of time, ii. 213.
- Mongrel Gospels* numbered by schools of philosophy, iii. 201.
- Monopoly*, need not exist under a protective tariff, iii. 379; of government banks, always oppressive, 353; of elective franchises in the hands of the President, 325, 326; none for different sections, 386.
- Monster Heresy* of persecution still alive in the church, ii. 370.
- MONTAIGNE and a host of writers on education referred to, i. 52.
- Monuments*, of human art, where found, i. 67; of Egypt, their testimony on ancient civilization, iii. 145.
- Moral Character* of man must be radically changed, iii. 488.
- Moral Code* of the Bible, no enemy to human enjoyment, ii. 111, 112; its excellence conceded by infidels, iii. 472; its effects, ii. 683; its influence essential to the peace of society, iii. 485.
- Moral Courage*, the power of, i. 169, 170;

- greatly needed in our statesmen, iii. 313.
- Moral Faculties*, importance of cultivating, in the young, i. 93.
- Moral Instruction*, a deficiency in, i. 507.
- Moral Law* of God, its nature and extent, ii. 87.
- Moral Truth*, its progress slow but sure, i. 284, 285.
- Morality* of college life, how regulated, i. 567.
- Morals* of the people greatly influenced by legislation, iii. 354.
- Moravian Brethren*, their first missions to the heathen, ii. 431, 433; their zealous and successful labours, 434.
- MORE, SIR THOMAS, sentenced to be hanged, but beheaded, iii. 416.
- MORRISON, DR., referred to, iii. 396.
- MORTON, the Regent, his remark at the grave of Knox, iii. 555.
- MOSES, facts recorded by, i. 66; his account of man's creation appealed to for man's primeval civilization, iii. 97; our only authority on the problems of the world's origin, 102; his history contains no trace of barbarism or savage life, 136; his account of the Deluge confirmed by science, 155; supposed to mention the peopling of America, 160; his character as a legislator, 285; his agreement with Herodotus on the cities of ancient Egypt, 179.
- MOSES and PLATO graduates of the universities of Egypt, iii. 150.
- Moses and the Prophets* credible as historians, iii. 127.
- MOSHEIM, the church historian, quoted, iii. 412.
- Moslems*, wars of extermination against, ii. 312.
- Mothers*, the best teachers for young children, i. 416; the first teachers, 517.
- Motives*, for education, should be held out in public-school systems, i. 480; for observing the Sabbath urged, ii. 103.
- Motto* of Americans should be Union, i. 354.
- Multiplication* of Western colleges an evil, i. 254.
- Murder*, scriptural definition of, iii. 563.
- Murderous Usages* of Christian society, iii. 537.
- MURRAY, DR. ALEXANDER, his *History of European Languages*, iii. 88.
- Mute Savages*, some found who could not be taught to speak, iii. 94.
- Mysteries*, in the providence of God, ii. 425; throughout the universe, 641; many unsolved, connected with revelation, i. 424; all revealed as soon as made known, ii. 670; some still unrevealed, 673; of the Bible, their character, iii. 205; of the gospel, committed to God's ministers, ii. 631; what is understood by, 633; used in various senses, 634, 637; known to us only as facts, 639; the facts intelligible, but not their nature, 639; this distinction illustrated, 640; ministers must have a knowledge of, 644; the instruments of salvation, 648; their influence on the ancient pagan world, 650; their efficacy in all ages and lands, 650; must be prominently held forth in all evangelical preaching, 655.
- Mysterious Doctrines* not found in the Bible, ii. 669.
- Mysterious Facts* found alike in nature and the Bible, ii. 669, 676.
- Mysterious Revelation* a contradiction in terms, ii. 669.
- Mystery*, definition of the word, ii. 633; its different applications in Scripture, 636, 637; its real import in Scripture, 669, 671; of the Trinity, 674; of godliness, what is implied in, 636.
- Mythology* of Greece, by whom originated, iii. 122.

N

- Name* of our republic, i. 577.
- NAPOLÉON BONAPARTE, referred to, ii. 224, 677; results of his occupation of Egypt, iii. 147.
- Nashville*, the city of, indebted to Dr. Lindsley for its growth, i. 56; description of, in 1830 and 1859, 57, 58; great improvements in, 59; enviable site for a great university, 154, 258; salubrity of its climate, 263; its advantages, 379-381; moral and religious aspects of, 382-385; graduates of its university, 569; obligations of the Christians in, iii. 502; their duties in the temperance cause, 602, 603; article on, 631.
- Nassau Hall*, i. 87.
- National Bank*, not an open question, iii. 337; the best form of, 368; two bills for, vetoed by Tyler, 369.
- National Churches*, established, antichristian, ii. 318; Protestant, their condition after the Reformation, iii. 423.
- National Currency*, indispensable elements of a sound, iii. 374, 375.
- National Debt*, how converted into a sound paper currency, iii. 373.
- National Independence*, American, secured by the services of Washington, iii. 252; distinguished from liberty, 311.
- National Roads* made by the government, iii. 339.
- National Union*, American, our obligations to, i. 288; its priceless value, 332; threatened dissolution of, 332.
- National University*, ought to be founded by the general government, i. 407; ought to teach every thing which can be learned anywhere, 408.
- Nations*, all pagan and Mohammedan,

- have holy days, ii. 111; the most ancient, all civilized, iii. 124, 126; inherent rights of sovereignty of, 336.
- Natural Science*, prejudice against, i. 603.
- Nature*, often an uncertain guide, iii. 82; has formed no new varieties of our race, 174; harmony of, with revelation, i. 446.
- Nature of evangelical repentance*, a sermon, ii. 593.
- Necessaries of life taxed in Tennessee for luxuries*, iii. 390.
- Necessity*, of regeneration, a sermon, ii. 381; how evinced, 512; of divine agency for man's salvation, 393; of revelation, 415; of creeds and confessions of faith, iii. 220; of circulating the Bible, 459.
- Neglect of obvious duties chargeable on all*, iii. 210, 211.
- Negro*, the race of the, not settled in Northern Africa, iii. 164; unchangeable physical characteristics of, 175; adapted to the factory as an operative, 388; mania concerning, at the North and South, 435; in America, must hold one of three conditions, 563; slavery of, in our country, 574; relation to the superior race, 583; relative condition in Africa and America, 577-581; present and ultimate condition of, 663-672.
- Netherlands*, universities of, i. 242.
- New Birth* essential to salvation, ii. 381.
- New England*, systems of education in, i. 508; virtues and defects of its schools, 511; Quixotic people in, 509; condition of its churches, ii. 713; dislike of, to the Embargo Act, iii. 319; ablest divines of, favoured Presbyterianism, 437, 438; first school system, how established, i. 545.
- New Haven*, revenue of, i. 88.
- New Heart*, in man, whence derived, ii. 514; indispensable to a Christian life, 385, 705, 720.
- New Jersey*, excellence of the Constitution of, iii. 294; broad seal of, 310.
- New Name* of our republic, i. 577.
- New School Presbyterians*, their experiments in church polity, iii. 437.
- New Testament*, moral code of, not objected to as too low, ii. 683; its testimony as to church government, iii. 403, 404; first grand charter of human rights, 489.
- NEWTON, SIR ISAAC, a model for young men, ii. 171; his relation to universal science, 416; his defence of Christianity to Dr. Halley, 471, 472.
- NEWTON, BISHOP, quoted on the peopling of Africa, iii. 163.
- Newspapers*, political and religious, their partisan character, iii. 571, 572.
- New World*, how first peopled, iii. 154; not of more recent origin than the Old, 155; not unknown to Plato and the priests of Egypt, 156-158; by whom and why colonized, 232.
- New York*, colleges of, i. 216; public-school system of, 477; its peculiar features, 478; the best system, 645.
- NIMROD leader of the attempt to build Babel, iii. 107, 129.
- Nineteenth Century*, its grand discovery of circulating the Bible, iii. 462.
- Nineveh*, the ancient city of, its origin and history, iii. 129.
- No Banks* better than our present banking-system, iii. 364.
- No Bishop, No King*, maxim of the British Solomon, iii. 407.
- No-Creed Churches*, their inconsistency, ii. 341-343; require a test of membership as much as others, iii. 451, 452.
- No-Creed Man* apt to be a pope in disguise, ii. 345.
- No Danger* in Christianity except from its abuse, iii. 495.
- No Escape* for the rejecters of the great salvation, ii. 707-709.
- No Hope* for the finally impenitent, ii. 628.
- No Nation* before the United States without an established religion, iii. 422.
- No Neutrality* on the temperance question, iii. 533.
- No Peace* to the wicked who despise the gospel, ii. 409.
- No Price* too great to pay for education, i. 132.
- No Salvation* without a knowledge of gospel truth, ii. 648.
- No Plea* from Scripture to justify strong drink, iii. 531.
- No Veteran* in crime reformed by prison-discipline, iii. 398.
- NOAH, the ark of, disproves a savage state at the flood, iii. 104; a husbandman and not a savage, 106; divided the earth by divine command, 128.
- Nobility*, titles of, contrary to the American Constitution, iii. 340.
- Noble Enterprises*, by some always cried down, iii. 475; of genius and wisdom in the temperance cause, 506.
- Nomina Clara* of philosophy not numerous, iii. 216.
- Nominal Christians*, still numerous in the church, ii. 398; strangers to the influence of the Bible, iii. 481; their character portrayed, 482.
- Nomination* of federal officers, to whom belonging, iii. 321, 322.
- Non-Episcopal Churches*, principles held in common by, iii. 403, 404.
- Non-Professors* still bound by the claims of the gospel, ii. 191.
- Normal Schools* early advocated by Dr. Lindsley, i. 36.
- North and South*, misunderstanding between, i. 338, 339.

Northern Colleges, causes of their success, i. 424.
Notes, bank, how made as good as gold, iii. 365, 370; treasury and government, as a circulating medium, 368, 373.
Nothing Unconstitutional when for the public good, iii. 385.
Nullification, consequences of the doctrine of, i. 339; scheme of political chieftains, 340; dangerous and delusive, 333.
Number of persons unable to read in several States, iii. 271.

O

Obedience to the Divine will, constitutes happiness, ii. 129; the paramount duty of, 251; mark of spiritual-mindedness, 575; the only sufficient evidence of true faith, 681.
Objections, to Nashville University answered, i. 375; against the moral code of the Old Testament raised by some, ii. 683; to eternal future punishment, fallacy of, 689; to arguments on church government, iii. 404, 405; alleged, against temperance societies, 511.
Objects worthy of man's nature presented, ii. 227.
Odium Theologicum of the Protestant clergy, iii. 207.
Offers of salvation through the blood of Christ, ii. 716.
Office, qualifications for, iii. 277; never sought by the author, iii. 315.
Office-Seekers, description of, iii. 277.
Office-Holders should be qualified, i. 441.
Officers, federal, should not all be appointed by the President, iii. 325; bank, how controlled, 366; their number and expense, 374; primitive church, how designated, 409, 446; three orders of, admitted, 438.
Offices often filled by incompetent men, i. 438.
Official Acts of churches, recognition of, iii. 454.
Official Aristocracy described, iii. 280.
Official Economists, their opposition to Bible Societies, iii. 491.
Old Age, irreligious, a sad picture, ii. 220; of indolence not to be desired, 180; premature, from ardent spirits, iii. 517.
Old and New Schools, Presbyterian, Dr. Lindsley's position, iii. 46.
Old Federalism, whence its name and origin, iii. 353.
Old Field Pedagogue, a description of Tennessee, iii. 630.
Old Testament Patriarchs, how vindicated, ii. 686.
Omnipotence of public opinion, iii. 529.
One Glass a Day, societies on this motto, iii. 533.

One-Man Power under the Federal Constitution, iii. 325, 326.
One System of doctrine revealed in the Bible, iii. 198.
One Term Only should be the law of the Presidency, iii. 344, 345.
One Thing Needful urged on all men, ii. 404.
Ophir of Solomon may be the American Peru, iii. 170.
Opinions, conflicting, as to Scripture doctrines, the origin, iii. 198; narrow and illiberal, how formed, 218.
Opposition, of Christians, to circulating the Bible, i. 308; to the first Bible Society, violent, iii. 523; various motives of, among bad men, 464.
Oppression, cruel, exhibited in all classic history, iii. 489.
Oppugners of religious prejudices should be cautious, iii. 194.
Opulence often becomes a curse, i. 625.
Oracles of God, their composition and safe keeping, iii. 459.
Orang Outangs held by Monboddo to be of the human family, iii. 91.
Ordination, Episcopal, identical with Presbyterian, iii. 444; of elders and deacons, 445.
Oriental Countries not so unchangeable as many allege, iii. 146.
Oriental Philosophy, its effect on the gospel, iii. 200.
Orientalists, the ancient, compared with modern nations, iii. 133.
Origin, of evil, a difficult problem, ii. 530; of the temperance reform, iii. 533.
Original Corruption of man's nature, cause of, ii. 687.
Original Genius, how elicited among the Greeks and Romans, i. 90.
Original Minds, their points of resemblance, ii. 9.
Original Settlers of our country, their principles and aims, iii. 232.
Orphans of drunkards, their fate, iii. 520.
Orthodoxy, often a cover for practical heresies, ii. 326; insufficient without practical piety, 544; sometimes found in the worst men, 682; the advocate of, how formed, iii. 219.
Orthography a special study of Dr. Lindsley, iii. 640.
Our Country greatly needing a gospel ministry, ii. 67, 68.
OVID, the Latin poet, indebted to traditions of Mosaic history, iii. 93.
OWEN, DR. JOHN, quoted, ii. 541.
Ownership of land, its importance to society, i. 490.

P

Pagan Nations had a substitute for the Sabbath, ii. 111.

- Pagan Nobleman* willing to be a Christian bishop, ii. 267.
- PALEY, DR. WILLIAM, quoted on the law of honour, i. 189; his Evidences quoted, iii. 540; quotation from, 358.
- Paper Constitutions* no safeguard against infuriated majorities, iii. 256.
- Paper Currency*, of some sort, indispensable, iii. 338, 367; may be more valuable than specie, 370, 371; advantages over gold and silver, 372; its loss not the annihilation of value, 372; a substitute for gold and silver, 549, 551.
- PARACELTUS, medical reforms of, i. 599.
- Paradise*, the primitive, the fountain of all civilization, iii. 84.
- Parental Authority*, too much neglect of, ii. 144.
- Parental Disappointment*, a source of, i. 389.
- Parents*, duties and responsibilities of, i. 382; their wrong interference with teachers, 389; should be compelled to educate their children, 500; mistaken notions of, 563; how they should train their children, iii. 484; responsible for drunken son, 522; could easily educate their children, 560.
- PARIS, GOVERNOR, of Maine, on public schools, i. 474.
- Paris*, the city of, its institutions and works of art, i. 409; its public libraries, 410; the medical schools of, 422.
- PARKER, ARCHBISHOP, a fierce persecutor, iii. 415.
- Parliament*, the British, how composed, iii. 285.
- Parochial Schools* not practicable in Tennessee, i. 644.
- Parsimony* in education, bad policy of, i. 132.
- Parsons*, how treated by State Constitutions, iii. 297.
- Parting* among friends, its lessons, ii. 295.
- Party*, definition of, iii. 571.
- Party Factions*, their danger in a republic, iii. 257.
- Party Feelings* discouraged, i. 377.
- Party Names*, no qualification for civil office, iii. 283; in ecclesiastical affairs, contrary to the gospel, 223.
- Party Politics*, young men warned against, i. 289; should be kept out of colleges, i. 377.
- Party Prejudices*, dangerous influence of, on youth, iii. 222.
- Party Spirit*, condemnation of, iii. 315.
- Passage* of men and animals to America, how effected, iii. 171.
- Pastoral Office*, a sermon on, ii. 303; nature and importance of, 304-308.
- Pastors*, of the church, how supplied, ii. 66; great need of, in our country, 67, 68.
- Paternal Counsels* to young men on leaving college, i. 371.
- Path* of glory open to all virtuous youth, i. 303.
- Pathology* of drunkenness, iii. 518.
- Patriarchs*, Old Testament, their imperfections explained, ii. 686.
- Patrician Order* never introduced among the American Colonies, iii. 252.
- Patriotism*, distinguished from party zeal, ii. 281; impossible without religion, i. 550; not a thing for empty boasting, 291.
- Patriots* appealed to in behalf of the Bible Society, iii. 467.
- Paul*, the Apostle, remarkable for decision of character, ii. 254, 257; his life a comment on Christian charity, 266; his precepts illustrated by example, 276; a model for Christian ministers, 305, 645; teaching and practice, 306; character of his preaching, 647; not ignorant of infidel objections and theories, 671; what he was before and after his conversion, 681; his Epistle to the Romans on justification by faith, 686, 687; quoted on temperance, iii. 532; grandeur of his character, 250.
- PAULDING, HON. JAMES K., letter of, iii. 77.
- Pauperism* caused by intoxicating liquors, i. 182.
- Paupers*, need not be found in our country, iii. 596; for the most part foreigners and Romanists, 596.
- Pay* of our legislators, iii. 289.
- Pedants and Pedagogues*, description of, iii. 272.
- Penitence*, genuine Christian, described, ii. 611.
- Penitentiaries*, in some points models for schools and colleges, i. 252; Eastern, confirm Bible principles, iii. 484.
- Penitentiary* of Tennessee, a sort of favourite State university, i. 384; a model manual labour establishment, 442.
- Penitentiary System*, views on, i. 151; might be superseded, 152; expensive and defective, 245, 246; compared with our college system, 247; of New York and Connecticut, 252.
- People*, must have knowledge to have power. i. 75; improvements of every kind commence with, 300.
- People*, competent to decide on church affairs from the Bible, iii. 433; how cheated by popular demagogues, 495; may be intelligent and virtuous under absolute monarchs, 240; of Europe, lack political training to fit them for free government, 241, 242; of London and Paris, compared with Athens and Rome, i. 72; American, their sovereignty, i. 300; how imposed on, 337; their relation to government, iii. 274; expect too much of government, 275; elect few federal officers directly, 326; have no

- control over the President, 348; how humbugged, 342, 358, 359; warned, 329; deceived and swindled by banks, 362, 367; slow to believe in the blessings of taxation, 377; prejudiced against a tariff, 378; what they ought to do for themselves, 394; the mass of, enjoy liberty in all countries in proportion as they know the Bible, 468, 469.
- Peopling*, of the earth among the sons of Noah, iii. 128; of America, conflicting theories on, 153; difficulties in the way of, 171; a subject beyond the assaults of geologists, 173.
- Perfect Rights* the only ones protected by human laws, iii. 487.
- Perfection* of the character of Washington, iii. 258.
- PERICLES referred to, iii. 326.
- Periodical Literature*, modern, on man's primeval savageism, iii. 88.
- PERIZONIUS and others on Plato's sunk Atlantis, iii. 156.
- Permanence* in the varieties of the human race, iii. 175.
- Pernicious Maxims*, many popular, pointed out, i. 180.
- Persecuting Spirit*, still alive in Christendom, ii. 350, 370; condemned by Christ, 681; whence derived, iii. 200.
- Persecution*, among Protestant Christians, ii. 314; of heretics, the common sin of Christendom, 350, 351; among the early American colonists, 374-376; for opinion, the worst of all heresies, iii. 213; its essential elements defined and illustrated, 212.
- Persecutors*, among professing Christians, ii. 315; cannot be true Christians, 681.
- Persians*, their destruction of learning and art in Egypt, iii. 145.
- Personal Experience* of a change of heart, how tested, ii. 397.
- Persons* of the Trinity, unsatisfactory illustrations of, ii. 675.
- Peruvians and Mexicans* not civilized, iii. 118.
- PESTALOZZI and other educators referred to, i. 521.
- PETER the Hermit, a saintly popular demagogue, iii. 496.
- Pettifogging Lawyers* and their compeers, i. 488.
- PHARAOH, the hardening of the heart of king, ii. 683.
- Pharisees* still numerous in the church, ii. 271.
- Pharmacy*, a branch of medical science, defined, i. 598; its importance in European schools, 599.
- PHELPS, ANSON G., referred to, iii. 597.
- Philanthropists* of Europe, discouragements of, i. 139.
- PHILIP, the deacon, in what capacity he preached, iii. 428.
- Philosophies*, human, powerless compared with the gospel, ii. 650.
- Philosophy*, its early cultivation in Egypt, iii. 140; Greek and Roman, early mixed with the gospel, 200; of Newton and Bacon, its spirit of inquiry, i. 283; unreasonable, in dogmatizing as to man's primitive state, iii. 147.
- PHOCION instanced, with Hampden, i. 266.
- Phœnicians*, their extensive voyages, iii. 168; concealed their art of navigation, 169; brought gold and silver from America, 170; belonged to the Caucasian variety, though Hamites, 175.
- Physicians*, responsibilities of, i. 220; oppose ardent spirits as a beverage, iii. 516; their testimony, 519; object to wine as a beverage, 530.
- Physiological Distinctions* not to be confounded with genealogical, iii. 175.
- PICART and PETAVIUS on early population of the earth, iii. 177.
- Picture*, of an ungodly young man, ii. 152-154; of hypocrisy and selfishness in the church, 273, 274.
- Piety*, early, recommended, a sermon, ii. 121.
- Pilgrims* of Plymouth Rock referred to, ii. 713.
- Pillars of Hercules* once the extreme western limits, iii. 157.
- Pioneers* in science and art, ii. 417.
- PITT, WILLIAM, referred to, iii. 326.
- PIZARRO and other examples of decision of character, ii. 254.
- Plans* of aiding the suffering poor, many objectionable, iii. 599.
- PLATO, his indebtedness to the schools of Egypt, iii. 149; his account of the lost Atlantis, 156, 157; confirmed by Moses, 161; like Moses, skilled in Egyptian learning, 161.
- Plea*, for the Theological Seminary at Princeton, a discourse, ii. 33; none for the finally impenitent, 708, 709; for the University of Nashville in 1829, i. 209.
- Pleasing God* rather than men, a sermon, ii. 249.
- Plebeian Classes* in England excluded from public affairs, iii. 253.
- Plenary Inspiration* of the Bible explained, ii. 666.
- Plymouth Rock*, the colony of, i. 452.
- Poetry*, of Greece and Italy, why representing the ancients as savages, iii. 120; influence on the early history of man, 122.
- Polemie Dogmatism* of theology repudiated, iii. 206.
- Policy*, of taxing land, reasons against, i. 489-494; of Washington's administration, iii. 259; of our first Congress, on banks, wise and cautious, 335, 336; American, too fluctuating to be sound

- and good, 346; the gigantic protective, of England, 383; our true, as to manufacturers, 384.
- Political Creeds*, intolerance of, ii. 346.
- Political Economy*, the science of, i. 240; as taught by Adam Smith, 286; a branch of practical ethics, 292; on the taxing of land, 489; on intemperance, iii. 526; a special study of Dr. Lindsley, 647.
- Political Pharisaism*, the remedy for, iii. 497.
- Political Questions* difficult to adjust, i. 336.
- Political Reform* difficult with a hereditary nobility, iii. 253.
- Political Systems* most erroneous, iii. 193.
- Political Tests*, iii. 310, 311.
- Political Training* essential to self-government, iii. 242.
- Politician*, requirements of an American, i. 288.
- Politicians*, their arts described, iii. 279; how they get power, 301.
- Politics*, national, all-controlling influence of, iii. 309.
- Polygamy*, made a ground of objection to the Bible, ii. 683; not to be tolerated on a plea of conscience, iii. 426.
- PONCE DE LEON, his famous fountain traced to Ælian, iii. 168.
- Poor*, mainly benefited by home colleges, i. 78; how they may be liberally educated, 96; taxation of, 148; their mode of rising in society, 149; should be educated gratuitously, 346; their defenders, 392; relieved by being taught to help themselves, 496; their claims on the rich, ii. 36; their taxation for strong drink, iii. 526; as much in danger of coveting as the rich, 595; their widows and orphans to be cared for, 596; their position in Europe and America, i. 148; their relations to the rich, 229.
- Poor Youth*, how they may go through college, i. 145, ii. 263.
- Pope of Rome*, held to be Antichrist by the Reformers, iii. 415; his subjects in the United States, 425.
- Popery*, growth of its power in the Middle Ages, iii. 203.
- Popes*, de facto, of our times, iii. 205; clerical and democratic, 301.
- Populace*, none in our country in the English sense, iii. 242.
- Popular Charity*, estimate of, ii. 266.
- Popular Demagogues*, how they ruin the people, i. 335, 337.
- Popular Education*, its legitimate ends, i. 301; a lecture on, 463; commended to the young as a sacred cause, 351; thoughts on, in Tennessee, 643; retarded by reliance on State aid, 644; how to be made universal, 646; essential to farmers and mechanics, iii. 304, 395; folly respecting, 604.
- Popular Fallacies*, i. 293; the source of public evils, iii. 495.
- Popular Prejudice* to be disregarded, iii. 394.
- Popularity* no test of merit in schools and colleges, i. 568.
- Population*, rapid increase of American, i. 467; of the South and West, scattered, 498; the earth's, in the times of Nimrod and Peleg, immense, iii. 130, 177; of the antediluvian world, very great, 99; favourable to the progress of the arts, when great, 100; inconsistent with an uncivilized state, 100; decline and increase in different ages, 182; of the Roman Empire in the days of Augustus, 181.
- Porcupine Family*, in England, referred to, iii. 176.
- PORSON and other Greek scholars referred to, i. 111, 523.
- PORTER, DR. EBENEZER, his testimony to Presbyterianism, iii. 438.
- Position*, the author defines his own, iii. 315.
- Poverty*, what it means in our country, i. 228; not the necessary lot of an American, 228; no qualification for office, iii. 282; in our country, mostly springs from idleness or crime, 596; how represented in the Scriptures, 599.
- Power*, of the President of the United States, vast, iii. 324, 325; how exercised towards his subordinates, 326, 327; of the United States to charter a bank, 335, 336.
- Practical Heresies* often ignored by the pulpit, ii. 325.
- Practical Persecutors* among the Protestant Reformers, ii. 315.
- Practical Truth* the most important to be understood, i. 179.
- Practice* the only sure test of orthodoxy, i. 324.
- Prayer*, the duty and privilege, ii. 573; a characteristic of the spiritually-minded, 573; necessary to salvation, 720.
- Preachers*, need a large stock of knowledge, i. 443; sectarian and uncharitable, reprov'd, 319.
- Preaching* on the mysteries of God, a means of salvation, ii. 648, 649.
- Precious Metals* of the ancients, probably from America, iii. 170.
- Prejudice*, against college officers, cruel and unjust, i. 116; in our country against learning, ii. 44, 45; against the gospel unreasonable, 481; concerning the primitive state of man, iii. 81; definition and illustration of, 191; the source of differences among Christians, 199; confirmed by bitter religious controversies, 209; example of the power of, 214.
- Prejudices*, religious, Dr. Lindsley's article on, iii. 191; political and religious, inveterate, 193; some salutary, some in-

- jurious, 193; against temperance societies, hard to overcome, 566.
- Prelatists*, their high claims, iii. 410; lordly power of, as proclaimed by Bancroft in 1588, 414.
- Preordination* of God a doctrine to be believed, ii. 673.
- Preparation* for coming to the Lord's table, ii. 541-551.
- Presbyter*, title of the highest ruler in the apostolic church, iii. 429; the only true apostolic bishop, 429.
- Presbyters*, identical in meaning with bishops, iii. 409; their number in the primitive church, 410.
- Presbytery*, early perverted from its scriptural simplicity, iii. 429; mode of its perversion in our times, 430; the only scriptural episcopacy, 444; of New Brunswick and Princeton Seminary, ii. 70.
- Presbyterian Bishops*, duty of, to teach the people church government, ii. 338; may be men of apostolic spirit, 339.
- Presbyterian Calvinism* not fatalism, ii. 359.
- Presbyterian Church*, its attitude in 1833, ii. 370; its government the best in the world, 338; its history and martyr-spirit in Scotland, iii. 407, 408; to what extent *jure divino*, 428; its full accordance with the gospel, 428; its principles, as adopted in the United States, 432, 433; how changed to episcopacy, 430; its scriptural officers acknowledged, 438; its form of polity not held to be absolutely perfect, 399, 439; elementary principles of, 400-404; defects of, 440.
- Presbyterian Clergy*, devoted to the cause of liberty, ii. 75; at times persecute each other, 354; falsely accused by Jefferson, 355; all whigs in the Revolution, 354; what they are bound to believe and teach, 356; may be rigidly orthodox and yet unchristian, iii. 450.
- Presbyterian Colonists* in New Jersey never persecuted, ii. 376.
- Presbyterian Confession* quoted on liberty of conscience, ii. 376.
- Presbyterianism*, a democratic system, ii. 58, 59; as held by Dr. Lindsley, 346; its battle with kingcraft in Scotland, iii. 407; its infancy under Roman despotism, 406; its genius accords with pure republicanism, 406; its position under state rule in Geneva and Holland, 408; its action when free and when established by law, 409; the only apostolic system of church government, 428; why it did not gain a foothold in England, 431; why adopted by the Westminster Assembly, 437; a little Congregationalized, 438.
- Presbyterians*, their early efforts for Princeton Seminary, ii. 74; their claims as to church government, 337; not to be confounded with Puritans, 352; never persecuted on American soil, 352, 353; most whigs in the Revolutionary War, 354; their position in Maryland, 375; disposed to glory in their church polity, iii. 406; stand on strong scriptural ground, 406; how treated by European governments, 423; asserted their independence in the American colonies, 423; their polity clearly laid down in their standards, 427; their character for piety and learning in all ages, 432; opinions on liberty of conscience and church power, 433; always zealous in the cause of education, 433; insist on an educated ministry, 434; not inimical to constitutional monarchy, 407; their sympathies in the American and French Revolutions, 408; approve episcopacy on scriptural grounds, 419, 420; supporters of schools, colleges, and theological seminaries, 434; never afraid of argument and free inquiry, 434; catholic and liberal towards other churches, 435; conservative and temperate on all political questions, 435; do not attack other churches, 436; quarrel with each other, but all defend their standards, 436; do not seek to make proselytes, 437; a law-abiding and loyal people, 439; follow the usages of civil government, 440; what they hold and claim on church government, 444; much spoken against for being Calvinists, 446; should study their own form of government, 448; how they should treat other churches, 452; concede equal rights to all Christians, 453; neither ask nor acknowledge superiority, 465.
- Presbyterians* of Scotland, all hold the old book of their fathers, iii. 436; always loyal to the British crown, 407; their heroic and martyr spirit, 408.
- Presbyteries and Synods*, courtesy of, due to corresponding members, iii. 454.
- President* of the United States, his power of appointment and removal, iii. 321-323, 348; limited by the Senate, 322; anti-democratic, 323, 324; should not have a veto, 344; should remove from office only *pro tempore*, 344; in case of death, his successor should be elected by the electoral college, 344; should be elected directly by the people, 345; how he should act on a point of conscience, 348, 349; should be shut out from the legislature, 349; his conscience cannot stand for law, 369.
- Pretensions* to learning rebuked, i. 609, 610.
- Prevention*, of crime, less costly than its punishment, i. 150; of disease not effected by ardent spirits, iii. 519; of

- drunkenness, total abstinence the only effective, 534.
- Pride*, of philosophy, its danger in religion, ii. 659; of system, its tendency to lead into error, 82.
- Priestcraft*, enormities of, ii. 309.
- Priesthood, Egyptian*, described by Diodorus Siculus, iii. 138; Levitical and Episcopal, compared, 448.
- PRIESTLEY, DR. JOSEPH**, an instance of strong religious prejudice, iii. 215.
- PRIESTLY, DR. JAMES**, President of Cumberland College, eulogy on, i. 117, 362.
- Priests*, Romish, their spirit and ambitious aims, i. 314; why opposed to the circulating of the Bible, iii. 498.
- Priests and Prophets*, necessity for learning among, ii. 42.
- Primary Schools*, indispensable importance of, i. 79.
- Primate of all England*, titles and powers of, iii. 418.
- Primeval Civilization of man* proved from reason, revelation, and history, iii. 84.
- Primeval Savageism of man* an indefensible dogma, iii. 151.
- Primitive Christians* bound by oath against wickedness, iii. 540.
- Primitive Navigators* must have had the compass or similar instruments, iii. 169.
- Primitive State of man*, theories of, i. 68; writers on, largely referred to, iii. 88; source of misconception respecting, 82; its savageism contradicted by history, 81, 112, 126.
- Princeton*, theological seminary of, referred to, i. 87; object of its founders, ii. 39, 40; its blessed fruits realized, 82, 230; solemn appeal in behalf of, 74.
- Principles*, of college government, pointed out, i. 113; of free trade, opposed by the practice of all nations, iii. 382.
- Printers' Art*, its influence on modern civilization, iii. 237.
- Printers' Blunders*, an article on, iii. 639.
- Printing Press*, its influence on the world, ii. 417; its power to preserve and perpetuate knowledge, iii. 116.
- Prisons and Penitentiaries*, expenses of, i. 150; discipline of, in the United States, 249.
- Private Education for the ministry*, its disadvantages, ii. 54.
- Private Interpretation of Scripture*, the right of, defended, ii. 342.
- Privileges*, religious and social, under the gospel, ii. 711.
- Prize of immortal life* set before us in the gospel, ii. 709.
- Problem*, of a future state, never solved by philosophy, ii. 696; of the peopling of America, how solved, iii. 156, 161; of self-government in America, i. 199.
- Problems of history* all solved by the doctrine of a divine government, ii. 449.
- Procrastination* in religion, absurd, ii. 717; why indulged in by the impenitent, 718.
- Prodigal Son* of the parable an example for sinners, ii. 717.
- Prodigious Prediction*, an article, iii. 647.
- Profanation of the Sabbath*, its effect in France, ii. 109.
- Profession*, the medical, its influence on temperance reform, iii. 517; of the teacher, magnified, i. 36; its qualifications and responsibilities, 525.
- Professional Business*, its effects on the mind, i. 123.
- Professional Charlatany* illustrated, i. 610.
- Professional Knowledge* not enough for professional men, i. 123.
- Professions*, various, in life, described, ii. 150-152.
- Professor of Biblical Archæology at New Albany*, iii. 399; of civil engineering needed in our colleges, i. 421.
- Professors*, required in a university, i. 410; their number, 401; their honours and emoluments in Germany, 404; their classification, iii. 272; of religion, several classes of, ii. 543.
- Programme of a university* marked out, i. 410, 411.
- Progress*, of arts among the antediluvians, iii. 100; of civilization during the last hundred years, 238; of the drunkard downward, 581.
- Prohibition*, total, of foreign commodities, sometimes wise, iii. 378, 379.
- Projects of future education* visionary and delusive, i. 499.
- Property*, always pays taxes, not poverty, i. 148; qualifications of, not wise, as limiting the right to vote, 484; how far desirable as an inheritance for children, ii. 35.
- Prophecies*, Scriptural, three classes of, ii. 669; fulfilled, always open to investigation, 669.
- Prophets*, had no successors, strictly speaking, iii. 409; and other officers of the New Testament church, 447.
- Prophets and Apostles of the Bible* not ignorant men, i. 144.
- Propositions of the Bible*, not mysterious, ii. 671; worthy of belief, although terms not fully comprehended, 680.
- Prosperity of our country*, dangers arising from, i. 335.
- Protection of home industry*, policy of, defended, iii. 385.
- Protective Duties* antagonistic to free trade, iii. 383.
- Protestant Christians*, their long neglect of heathen nations, ii. 430; united in the Bible Society, iii. 501; ought to support it liberally, 502; causes of divisions among, 430.

- Protestant Clergy*, illiberality and bitterness of, iii. 207; their grounds of difference small, 208.
- Protestant Creeds*, similarity of, ii. 347.
- Protestant Europe*, a sad spectacle of divisions among its Reformed churches, ii. 430; what it owes to the Bible, iii. 469.
- Protestantism*, its whole history full of instances of folly, iii. 208.
- Protestants*, divisions among, ii. 430; their common principle of church government, iii. 404; their sole rule of faith, 451; challenge the exercise of every man's reason, 464; divided into rival sects soon after the Reformation, 461; ought to have circulated the Bible from the first, 461.
- Providence of God*, special, universal, external, ii. 444-446; a source of joy to men, 447; embraces all things, 673.
- Public Colleges* should not be sectarian, i. 257.
- Public Education*, its paramount value, i. 486; essential for ministers of the gospel, ii. 48, 49.
- Public Evils* removed by instructing the people, i. 340.
- Public Life* full of dangers, ii. 279.
- Public Office*, not to be coveted, i. 289; for whose benefit created, 291, iii. 276.
- Public Officers*, how tested, iii. 283; to be dealt with as if they were rogues, 325, 359.
- Public Opinion*, the omnipotence of, iii. 529, 534.
- Public Press*, its relation to science and literature, i. 612.
- Public Schools*, for all classes, advocated, i. 347; the system of, in Connecticut, 471; in Massachusetts, 473; in New York, 477.
- Public Seminaries*, their superior advantages, ii. 50.
- Public Worship*, an ordinance of God, ii. 100; the Sabbath essential to, 100; the forms of, 339; too often a mere form, 488.
- Pulpit*, its great power when worthily filled, ii. 28, 29; its deplorable defects in our day, 22; its zealots often guilty of bearing false witness, i. 320.
- Punch and a Bishop*, article on, iii. 616.
- Punishment*, of sin, not confined to this life, ii. 624; reasonable and just, 689; eternal, because sin will never cease, 690, 691; proportionate to the offence, 690; of crime costs more than the education which would prevent it, i. 150; often evaded, iii. 546; of delinquent bank officers, 366.
- Pupils of Dr. Lindsley*, their number and character, i. 54.
- Pure Religion*, constituent elements of, ii. 681.
- Pure Wine*, its use not prohibited in Scripture, iii. 531.
- Puritans*, English, why mostly Independents, iii. 431; inclined to Presbyterianism at first, 431; Hall's work on, 414; of New England inclined to Presbytery, 434; their modern descendants greatly apostate from the ancient faith, ii. 713.
- Pursuits of ambition* delusive and dangerous, ii. 277-280.
- Pyramids of Egypt*, social condition of their builders, iii. 133.
- PYTHAGORAS, an example of diligent, laborious study, ii. 178; origin of his theory of the sun as the centre of the universe, iii. 143; where he learned astronomy, 148; why persecuted at home, 148; his doctrine, how discovered and lost, 144.

Q

- Quack Doctors* classified, i. 488.
- Quackery* in teaching, i. 390.
- Quakers*, proverbial for veracity without an oath, i. 294; their opposition to ardent spirits, iii. 539.
- Quasi-Episcopacy*, how it might be introduced into the Presbyterian Church, iii. 430.
- QUEEN ELIZABETH, her remark at the approach of death, ii. 221.
- Question*, the old one between England and America, iii. 234.
- Qui facit per alium facit per se*, iii. 425.
- QUINCTILIAN advocated the superiority of a public education, i. 66, ii. 48; his opinion that speech was the gift of God, iii. 93.
- Quixotic Efforts* of New England philanthropy, i. 509, iii. 670.

R

- Races of man* as distinctly marked at the dawn of history as at the present day, iii. 174.
- Radicalism*, prevalence of its various forms, i. 398.
- RALEIGH, SIR WALTER, his estimate of learning at death, i. 276.
- RAMSAY, DR. DAVID, on established churches in Virginia and Maryland, ii. 375.
- Rational Christianity*, its insidious disguises, ii. 77.
- Reading*, new mode of teaching the art of, i. 513; of books, not always profitable, ii. 243; superficial, tends to enervate the mind, i. 109.
- Reading and Writing*, ignorance of, in England and America, i. 238; proper qualifications for voting, 484.
- Reason*, human, unable to solve the problem of our salvation, ii. 391; insufficient to discover any scheme of redemption,

- 637; its office in science and philosophy, 664; satisfied to believe on testimony, 676; not contradicted by Scripture, 677; its province as to testimony, 678; proof from, in favor of man's primeval civilization, iii. 84.
- Reasoning*, in a circle, example of, ii. 689; of the impenitent, false and fatal, 718; fallacious mode of, touching ancient Egypt, iii. 145.
- Reasons* for serving God in youth, ii. 128.
- Rebellion* in Rhode Island under Dorr, iii. 293.
- Reciprocity*, courteous, the only rule of church fellowship, ii. 366, iii. 453.
- Recollections*, Dr. Lindsley's, of the death of Washington, iii. 234.
- Redeemer* of man merciful and gracious, iii. 489.
- Redeeming* of time, what it imports, ii. 203.
- Redemption*, scheme of, as represented by Paul, ii. 645.
- Reductio ad Absurdum*, applied to the Epicurean theory, iii. 97.
- Reform*, in office, how effected, iii. 281; in state politics needed, 309; in the legislature, 288.
- Reformation*, moral, the first step towards, i. 151; must be founded on the Bible, iii. 483; in prisons effected only by the Bible, 544; of criminals, not the sole end of punishment, i. 248; of hardened criminals visionary, 250; of life, exhortations to, ii. 175, 176; of the drunkard once regarded as hopeless, iii. 507; the temperance, its achievements, 527; its origin in the United States, 533; its progress over the world, 533; needed in our school systems, i. 144; of the sixteenth century, the commencement of a brighter era, i. 72, iii. 461; the result of the restoration of learning, i. 343; its influence marred by party strife, ii. 429.
- Reformed Churches* of the sixteenth century all Calvinistic in doctrine, ii. 348.
- Reformers*, of the church, men of great learning; ii. 46; sometimes intolerant persecutors, 314; early English, recognized non-episcopal churches, iii. 411; Puritan, denied the church of Rome to be a true church, 415.
- Regeneration*, why necessary for man, ii. 331, 382; a matter to be tested only by experience, 394; the fruits of, 395; necessary to salvation, 512; the work of the Holy Spirit, 513; a doctrine clearly taught in Scripture, 686; a mystery to the natural man, 700.
- Regrets* on a dying bed, iii. 502, 604.
- Religion*, Christian, essential in every system of education, i. 47, 48; indispensable for all men, 168, 304; its rank among well-educated people, 304; commended to young men, 550-552; progress of the Christian, in the first three centuries, iii. 421; of the Bible the only one worthy of credit, 474; alone in refusing state alliances, 492; in the United States free of all state trammels, 422; a false one better than none, 193.
- Religions* all alike protected in our country, i. 318.
- Religious Differences*, their influence on popular education, i. 645.
- Religious Education* need not be sectarian, i. 51.
- Religious Establishments*, i. 310.
- Religious Liberty*, perfect only in America, i. 312, iii. 424, 498; denied to Roman Catholics by their rulers, 425, 426.
- Religious Partisans* dangerous to the country, i. 316.
- Religious Passion* the most uncontrollable, i. 316.
- Religious Prejudices*, article on, iii. 191; not to be eradicated by opposition, 193; removed only with caution, 194.
- Religious Principle*, the power of, i. 165.
- Religious Sects*, their proselyting schools and colleges, i. 256.
- Remedy*, the only one yet found for intemperance, iii. 510; for the present vicious banking system, 552.
- Reminiscences* of Dr. Stanhope Smith, iii. 652.
- Removal* from office by the President, iii. 341.
- Repentance*, doctrine of, proclaimed in Judea, ii. 194; nature of evangelical, defined, 596; connected with faith, 599, 606; first step in the exercise of, 600; motives to, 601; necessity of, 602; reasonableness of, 613; essential to salvation, 615; blessed results, 617; prompted by a view of Christ's sufferings, 618; urged as a duty on all, 619; calls to, 621; commanded by God, 626.
- Representative System* of government unknown to the people of Europe, iii. 241.
- Representatives* of the people should be educated men, i. 447.
- Republic*, American, not ungrateful to its benefactors, iii. 229; maintained by intelligence and the gospel, i. 327, 455; dangers and destiny, 349, 466; not to be despaired of, 344; the Liberian, in advance of any republic of Spanish America or Europe, iii. 579.
- Republican Government*, excellency of, in America, i. 78; the growth of two centuries, iii. 245; its forms may be retained when the spirit is gone, 256; how maintained in its purity, i. 469; name of, 579.
- Republicans*, the inconsistencies of, i. 214, 466.
- Republics*, the ancient, different from ours as to origin, iii. 245; possible after the destruction of our present Union, 255.

- Researches* in Egypt confirm the sacred and classical historians, iii. 148.
- Resemblance* between the inhabitants of Northwestern Europe and Northeastern America, iii. 173.
- Resignation*, the duty of Christian, i. 452.
- Resistance* to the Federal Constitution, iii. 310.
- Responsibility*, of bank-officers, iii. 366; of educated men, i. 173.
- Restitution*, the duty of Christians to make, ii. 320.
- Result* of the license system, to increase drunkenness, iii. 391.
- Resurrection* of the dead, in what sense a mystery, ii. 640; credible as a fact attested, 669; its mode a profound mystery, 670.
- Retaliation*, the spirit of, should be unknown among Christians, iii. 452.
- Retrospect* of the past year, ii. 231.
- Revealed Religion*, always connected with human learning, ii. 45-47; not confined to the cloister, 49; its essential nature described, 106; indispensable to man, 109; commended to the young, 140; why repulsive to the young, 142, 143, 168; should be our chief concern, 234; its terms and conditions, 237; an object of instruction, 343; does not consist in single acts or frames of mind, 363; true experience of, lost in some quarters, 613; its relation to creeds and confessions, 345; man's only ground of hope, 638; its influence on life and character, 621.
- Revelation*, Divine, decried as unnecessary by infidels, ii. 132; necessity for, 415; man's agency in diffusing the knowledge of, 415; the unsolved problems of, 424; conditions on which it was made, 425; new and universal at the advent of Christ, 428; the effects of, 650; its agreement with man's faculties, 665; the sacred writer's claims to, 667; ceases to be mysterious as far as made known, 668, 669; not against or above human reason, 671; of things above reason not incredible, 678.
- Revelations*, of God, to Adam, Noah, and Abraham, ii. 426; given in the earliest ages, 427.
- Revenue*, of Harvard University, i. 216; of government most easily raised by a tariff, iii. 377.
- Revolution, American*, its objects and aims, i. 76, iii. 311; our aids during the war of, i. 139; influence on the world, iii. 239; cause of its successful issue, 240; not waged against monarchy, 406.
- Revolution* in popular customs a difficult task, iii. 509.
- Revolutions* in modern times, why unsuccessful, iii. 239.
- Review*, North American, its estimate of Dr. Lindsley, iii. 78.
- Revival* of religion in Nassau Hall illustrating Presbyterian liberality, iii. 437.
- Rhode Island*, religious freedom in, ii. 354; the Eden of democracy, iii. 293.
- RICARDO and other writers, i. 124.
- RICE, DR. JOHN H., iii. 28.
- Rich and Poor*, how related to society, i. 148.
- Riches*, a limitation in the pursuit of, ii. 35; the love of, dangerous, 225; article on, iii. 589; Scripture texts on, 590-592.
- Rich Men*, the difficulty of their salvation, ii. 226, iii. 600; often benefactors of our country and models of thrift, 596.
- Riding Committee* of the church of Scotland, iii. 441.
- Rights* of man, as understood by our forefathers, i. 176; to decide for himself what is Scripture, ii. 665.
- Rights*, perfect and imperfect, distinguished, iii. 479; of man never understood by pagan nations, 489; of Englishmen asserted by our fathers, 311; of government to charter a bank, 336; of the States under the Constitution, 308, 310, 385; of the President to remove from office, 311; of woman secured by the Bible, 490.
- Rights* of conscience, allowed when consistent with other rights, iii. 426; understood by all sects under persecution, 565; how violated by Roman Catholic rulers, 425; contended for by the Presbyterian Huguenots of France, 408; null and void in the English church, according to Hooker, 413; not affected by the existence of negro slavery in our land, 580.
- Rigid Presbyterians* may be sorry Christians, ii. 339.
- Rising Generation* saved from crime only by the Bible, iii. 484.
- Rites*, ceremonial, not the essence of religion, ii. 364.
- RITTENHOUSE, DR. DAVID, referred to, iii. 396.
- Ritual System*, its basis, iii. 427; predominates in established churches, 427.
- Rival Sects*, their bitter party strifes, i. 315.
- ROBERTSON, DR. WILLIAM, his History of America, on man's original state, iii. 93; opinion as to American aborigines, 118.
- ROBINSON, REV. JOHN, his testimony to Presbyterian church officers, iii. 438.
- ROCHEFOUCAULT and CHESTERFIELD referred to, i. 195.
- ROCHESTER and GARDINER, warnings to young men, ii. 153.
- ROGER BACON and others suffering persecution for science, i. 284.

- Rogues*, intelligent and astute, escape the laws, iii. 486.
- Roman Catholics*, subject to spiritual despotism in America, iii. 425, 426; of Maryland, by whom persecuted, ii. 353.
- Roman Civilization* derived from the Greeks, iii. 152.
- Roman Consuls*, their term of office, iii. 345; stable and durable policy of, 345.
- Roman Patriotism*, ancient, the glory of, i. 353.
- Romish Church*, pretended miracles of, ii. 668; its hierarchy the embodiment of Antichrist, iii. 422; its dogma on the creed, 553.
- Rotation in office*, to what extent proper, i. 291.
- ROUSSEAU, J. J., his opinion of Christ, ii. 136.
- Royal Interference* in legislature illustrated, iii. 350.
- Royal Supremacy*, recognized in the church of England, iii. 415; a fatal and corrupting dogma, 416; its effect on civil and religious liberty, 416.
- Ruined Structures* in Central America and Mexico, their builders, iii. 166.
- Ruinous Heresy* on the part of farmers and mechanics, iii. 270.
- Rule*, the two-thirds, in Congress, should be abolished, iii. 344.
- Ruling Elders*, testimony of Congregationalists in favour of, iii. 438.
- RUMFORD, COUNT, and all self-made men, indebted to colleges, i. 342.
- RUSH, his Charges, quoted, on the Sabbath, ii. 110.
- RUSH, DR. BENJAMIN, an advocate of temperance, iii. 518.
- Russia* finding her real strength in manufactures, iii. 380.
- RUTHERFORD, REV. SAMUEL, in the Westminster Assembly, iii. 432.
- S
- Sabbath*, the duty of observing, ii. 87; the day changed from the last to the first of the week, 88; prohibitions on, 89; its rest intended for man and beast, 90; works of necessity and mercy excepted, but not numerous, 92; a day of devotion, 94; how made a delight and blessing, 95; does not require austerity and superstition, 96; how observed by our Saviour, 97; not violated by doing good, 98; its sanctity not violated by teaching in Sunday-schools, 99; how perverted by the Jews, 96; its proper observance, 95; reasons for its observance, 103; not an arbitrary institution, 104; essential to public worship, 105; respect for, essential to Christianity, 107; advantages as a discipline and means of grace, 106; its shameful profanation in our land, 108; violations of, should be punished, 115.
- Sabbath-Breaker*, proverbial bad character of, ii. 113; criminality of, among the Jews, ii. 93.
- Sacerdotal Colleges* of ancient Egypt, iii. 144.
- Sacred Writers*, testify to their own inspiration, ii. 667; strike at all sin in its roots, 548.
- Sacrifice of Isaac* explained and defended, ii. 684, 685.
- Safeguards*, of our government, pointed out, iii. 257; of the banking system in Scotland, 364.
- Salaries* of American judges, considered, iii. 290.
- SALLUST and other Latin authors quoted, iii. 554.
- Salvation*, by the gospel, wholly of divine grace, ii. 87, 408; the only true method of, 392; the great business of life, 404; offered to all freely and made attainable, 406; impossible in the case of the finally impenitent, 493; not secured by any works of legal merit, 524; rejected by the Jews, 702; the only way of escape from perdition, 703; its greatness, 704; its fulness and freeness, 706; the gift of God through Christ, 710; adequate to the vilest sinners, 716.
- Sanctification* of the Sabbath, what it requires, ii. 94.
- Saracens*, their preservation of science and literature, i. 435.
- Satan*, character of, as portrayed by Milton, ii. 256; in the disguise of an angel of light, in the church, iii. 494.
- Savage State*, man not created in, i. 68; traceable to the want of instruction as its primal cause, 69; not known in the time of Noah and his sons, iii. 106; not the primeval condition of our race, 83, 113; the result of a degeneration from pre-existing civilization and man's depravity, 83, 114.
- Savageism* of man, not his original condition, iii. 85, 112; long a favourite dogma of philosophy, 88; traceable to the confusion of tongues at Babel, 101, 113; no trace of, in the world before the time of Nimrod, 109, 113; the consequence of penal judgments at Babel, 187.
- Savages*, the first mention of, in history, iii. 110, 114; unassisted by aid from abroad, never rise to civilization, 116; of America and Africa accounted for, 187.
- SAVIOUR, his command to preach the gospel begins to be obeyed, iii. 479.
- SAY, and other political writers, on the poor, i. 501.
- Scepticism*, no proof of genius, i. 282; triumph of, after the Reformation of Luther, ii. 431; danger of indulging in, iii.

- 282; intrepid in denying the proofs of ancient civilization, 149.
- Sceptics*, their unfair dealing with Christianity, i. 306.
- Scheme* of man's redemption, above all human power and wisdom, ii. 637; its truths the mysteries of God, 639.
- Schemes* of popular education, different ones suggested, i. 644.
- Scholars* should be exempt from prejudice, iii. 194.
- Scholarship*, indiscriminate reading ruinous to, i. 110; rewarded with high honours in the Eastern States, 426; profound, needed in the study of Scripture, iii. 206.
- Scholastic Sophists* of the Middle Ages, their character, iii. 202.
- School Funds*, large accumulation of, a doubtful policy, i. 497-499, iii. 563; of Tennessee, their origin and mismanagement, i. 497, 531; their inutility, 647.
- School-Houses*, the need of, in Tennessee, i. 131.
- Schoolmasters*, the duties of, i. 105; how competent ones are to be supplied, 235; their work in Europe, 242, 243; their status in society, iii. 268; allies of farmers and mechanics, 270; great number necessary, 271; divided in four classes, 272.
- Schoolmen* of the Middle Ages, their tactics, iii. 203.
- Schools*, of the Greeks and Romans, i. 91; common, importance of, in our country, 131; higher classification of, 127; primary and classical, needed everywhere, 133-135; collegiate and popular, what they would do for Tennessee, 136; advantages of all classes of, 236; names of, unimportant, 345; kind most needed in Tennessee, 346; how established and maintained, 470; different systems of, 471; many no better than nuisances, 517; by what denomination first founded in America, iii. 434; of the ancient Egyptian priesthood, their objects, 139; of interpretation as to the Federal Constitution, 331.
- SCHWARTZ quoted on education, i. 478.
- Science*, culture of, among the ancients, i. 71; in Egypt and Chaldea, monopolized by priests, 72; its influence with the Bible on slavery, 73; should not be sectarian, 257; not discordant with revelation, 629; its prerogative to remove error and prejudice, iii. 195; progress of, during the last hundred years, 238; of astronomy, traced to Noah and Adam, 144; how lost in Egypt, 145; connection between all, ii. 242; human and divine, full of mysteries, 642.
- Scots*, the sturdy Presbyterian, opposed to kingcraft, iii. 407.
- SCOTT, DR. THOMAS, his experience on religious prejudice, iii. 215.
- Scottish Commissioners*, their influence in the Westminster Assembly, iii. 431.
- Scottish General Assemblies* continue from year to year by commissions, iii. 430.
- Scottish Universities*, like the German, have no costly buildings, i. 416.
- Scriptural Miracles* gain by comparison with all others, ii. 669.
- Scriptures*, Sacred, the study of, essential to education, i. 50; theories of their inspiration, ii. 666; nowhere contradict human reason, 677; their evidence against a primeval savage state, iii. 97, 113; their spirit opposed to uncharitable controversy, 210; passages of, on the condition of the negro race, 574-576; passages of, relating to riches and poverty, 590-592; their testimony strong, against strong drink, 538.
- Seal*, the broad, of the State of New Jersey, iii. 310.
- Season*, an article on the, iii. 613.
- Secret*, the chief, of all sound banking systems, iii. 363.
- Secret Crimes* beyond the reach of human laws, iii. 479.
- Secretaries* of departments, their position in the National Cabinet, iii. 327; in what sense advisers of the President, 327.
- Sectarian Colleges*, injurious effects of, i. 254, 255; increase of, in our country, 265; highly objectionable, 315, 316.
- Sectarian Doctrines* not to be taught in institutions of learning, i. 316, 378.
- Sectarian Domination*, no danger of, in our land, ii. 58.
- Sectarian Spirit*, inimical to Christianity, i. 322; denounced and abjured, 325, iii. 455.
- Sects*, all on a perfect equality in our country, i. 318; early developed in the church, ii. 232, 233; their influence among the Jews, iii. 200; illiberal contests in the Christian, of our day, 204; all professedly stand on Scripture, 222; shunned by Dr. Lindsley, 315; should be restrained from domestic persecution, 425, 426; their adoption of the temperance cause, 539.
- Sedition Laws*, iii. 343; a nullity under Jefferson, 350.
- Sees* of ancient bishops, how derived, iii. 417, 418.
- SELDEN, JOHN, head of the Erastian party in the Westminster Assembly, iii. 432.
- Self-Culture* essential to improvement, iii. 115.
- Self-Deception* of man, as to his sin and danger, common, ii. 476.
- Self-Denial*, under the gospel, promotes man's happiness, ii. 186.
- Self-Examination*, as to the right use of

- time, salutary, ii. 210; a sermon on the duty of, 535; incumbent on all who come to the Lord's Table, 539.
- Self-Government*, the duty taught, i. 370; political, exercised by the first settlers of America, iii. 232; fixed habit of our ante-Revolutionary fathers, 243; grand problem of, to be solved in our country, i. 199.
- Self-Interest*, the blinding influence of, on moral questions, iii. 535-538.
- Self-Knowledge*, difficult in nations as in individuals, i. 464; the great importance of, 464.
- Self-Made Men*, indebted to the university, i. 27, 436; do not rely on genius alone, 202; who they are, 342; long list of, 436; other examples, 619.
- Self-Taxation* an essential condition of constitutional liberty, iii. 247.
- Selfishness* of ambitious men in the ministry, fearful picture of, ii. 70, 71.
- Seminaries*, at home, the benefits of, i. 78; effect of increasing, 81; of learning, in the West, establishment of, i. 212; instituted in the Middle Ages, iii. 202.
- Seminary*, the Theological, at New Albany, iii. 399.
- Senate* of the United States, functions of, iii. 305; popular idea of, a perversion, 307.
- Senators*, should be independent, national legislators, iii. 305, 306; how chosen, 318, 319; when bound to obey instructions, 308.
- Sense* of guilt in man, cannot be shaken off, ii. 518.
- Senses*, physical, their use in gaining knowledge, ii. 664.
- Separation* of religion from the state, an idea long unknown, iii. 420, 421; first effected in America, 422.
- Sermons*, Dr. Lindsley's, on the Duty of Observing the Sabbath, ii. 87; on Early Piety, 121; on True Wisdom, 157; on Improvement of Time, 205; on Pleasing God, 249; on the Pastoral Office, 303; on the Necessity of Regeneration, 381; on the Necessity of Revelation, 415; on Divine Government, 439; on the Conduct of the Unbelieving, 469; on Human Depravity, 497; on Self-Examination, 535; on Spiritual-mindedness, 565; on Evangelical Repentance, 593; on the Mysteries of God, 631; on the Bible adapted to Man, 663; on the Great Salvation, 701.
- Servants* entitled to the Sabbath for rest, ii. 90, 91.
- SERVETUS*, connection of Calvin with his condemnation, ii. 350, 351.
- Service*, outward splendor of the Jewish religious, iii. 401.
- Servile Classes*, condition of, in ancient and modern nations, iii. 133.
- SEWALL, DR. THOMAS*, quoted, iii. 519.
- SHAKESPEARE*, quotations from, iii. 280, 396, 554; his example, with others, cited, 231.
- SHERMAN, ROGER*, how he rose to eminence, i. 303, iii. 282.
- Shibboleths* of modern church parties, iii. 497.
- SIMON MAGUS*, type of existing character in the church, ii. 71; his case referred to, ii. 542.
- Sin*, the source of all unhappiness, ii. 383; its seductive influences, 475; its origin, nature, and extent, 500-503; united with misery, 511; its existence a mystery unsolved, 671; original, of our first parents, 686; in every case must be punished, 689; views of, as an infinite evil, 690; its penalty eternal, 691; its guilt and enormity unsearchable, 691; aggravated by neglect of privileges, 703; forgiven only through the blood of Christ, 704, 705.
- Sincerity* necessary to religion, ii. 587.
- Single Prejudice*, invincibility of a, iii. 208.
- Sinners*, inexcusable for rejecting the gospel, ii. 407; why they reject Christ, 487; representation of their case, 519; helpless condition of, by nature, 687; coming doom of the impenitent, 708, 709; their reasons for delay absurd, 717; entreated to turn to God, 719.
- SIR THOMAS MORE*, an example of martyrdom, i. 457.
- Slave-Trade*, iniquity and cruelty of, ii. 311; once followed by Christian nations without compunction, iii. 523.
- Slaveholding*, no one compelled to adopt it, iii. 580.
- Slavery*, in ancient Egypt, no disproof of civilization, iii. 132; negro, in America, the source of many evils, 394, 664; two extreme views of, held, 557; subject to the people of each State and Territory, 571; the sin of Christendom, 669; five modes suggested for its extinguishment, 572; not national, 571; questions touching its origin and end, 579; in the English colonies, 669; final destruction of, in America, 672.
- Slaves*, of necessity, ignorant, i. 485; should have the Bible, iii. 665; cannot be kept in perpetual bondage, iii. 665, 669.
- Sleighting* at Nashville described, iii. 614.
- SMITH, ADAM*, founder of the system of political economy, i. 286; his doctrines controverted, iii. 381, 389.
- SMITH, DR. SAMUEL STANHOPE*, iii. 14; his successful presidency of the College of New Jersey, 656; his public works, 667; hospitality and liberal sentiments, 658; great talents for government, 654; reminiscences of, 652; eloquence and learning of, 653; his ability as a teacher,

- 654; method of instruction, 655; his person and character, 660; his last days, 661.
- Social Degradation* caused by popular ignorance, i. 150.
- Social Intercourse*, in Tennessee, character of, i. 430, 431; rule for Christian denominations in, ii. 266, 267.
- Social System* of education, i. 516.
- Societies*, Bible, tract, and missionary, poorly supported, ii. 313; colonization, inadequate to remove the African race, iii. 670; American temperance, advocated, iii. 505; their origin, 510; their rapid progress, 511; British and Foreign Bible, when founded, 463; catholic character of, 463; progress and successes, 464; first American Bible, when founded, 465; projectors of, knew not its prospective greatness, 474.
- Society*, money-making people its best members, i. 229; importance of the industrious classes to, ii. 34; condition of, without a Sabbath, 108; without the Bible, iii. 486.
- Socinian Leaders* dangerous on account of their learning, ii. 79.
- SOCRATES and other types of the best pagan virtue, ii. 135.
- Sodom*, the destruction of, ii. 470, 710.
- Solar System*, theory of, known in Egypt before Pythagoras, iii. 143; how lost, 145.
- Soldiers* need not the stimulus of strong drink, iii. 527.
- SOLOMON, King, an advocate of learning, i. 628, iii. 326.
- SOLON, his judgment as to true happiness, ii. 223; and other Grecian sages, their lack of moral light, 420; why they visited Egypt, iii. 148.
- Sons* of farmers and mechanics, why they should be educated, iii. 271.
- Sophistry* of those who reject the gospel, ii. 718.
- Sorrow* for sin an element of true repentance, ii. 604.
- Sots* manufactured by distilleries and dram-shops, iii. 537.
- Soul* of man, its true value, ii. 289; not satisfied with earthly things, 214; its immortality not disproved by materialism, 696; rests exclusively on God's testimony, 697.
- Sources* of all human knowledge indicated, ii. 675.
- South* should assert and secure her rights in the Union, iii. 571.
- South-Sea Bubble* referred to, iii. 362.
- SOUTHARD, HON. SAMUEL L., referred to, iii. 13.
- Southern Chivalry*, its disunion sentiment, iii. 562.
- Southern States*, their sentiments and habits on education, i. 645.
- Southern Students* at Eastern colleges, i. 260.
- Southern Volunteers*, why preferred in the Mexican War, iii. 567, 569.
- Sovereign* of Great Britain not supreme over the ministry, iii. 328.
- Sovereign Power* of the President of the United States, iii. 323.
- Sovereignty*, State, limited by the national, iii. 313.
- Speech*, public, about colleges, by Dr. Lindsley, i. 555.
- Speech*, human, attainment of, slow and difficult, iii. 94; at first received by inspiration of God, 95.
- Specimens* of objections alleged against the Bible, iii. 683, 684.
- Speedy Degeneration* of the race after the dispersion at Babel, iii. 109, 113.
- Spirit of God*, necessary to change the heart, ii. 586-588; with his providence, calls for repentance, 719.
- Spirit*, of truth, required by the Bible, ii. 681; of the gospel, consists in giving freely to others, iii. 539.
- Spirits*, ardent, to be used only as a medicine, iii. 516.
- Spiritual Body* not explained in the Scriptures, ii. 670.
- Spiritual Destitution* in parts of Virginia, iii. 425.
- Spiritual-mindedness*, a sermon on, ii. 565, 569; character of, described, 571, 579; evidences of, 570, 578; blessed rewards of, 581, 583.
- Spiritual Rulers*, their mastery over man's conscience, iii. 425.
- Spitting Animal*, designation of Americans, iii. 623.
- Splendid Project* of the British colonial policy in America, iii. 233.
- SPRAGUE, DR. WILLIAM B., his testimonial of Dr. Lindsley, i. 17; his Annals of the American Pulpit, 12, iii. 16, 261.
- Spurious Christianity*, what it has done, i. 309.
- Standing Army*, none needed in our country, iii. 242.
- State*, its true policy touching education, i. 146; its power over the church of England, iii. 420; its encroachments on the church under Constantine, iii. 421; of civilization, how attained by men and nations, 83, 114.
- State Banks*, existed at the formation of our Constitution, iii. 375; objections to stock, 338, 584.
- State Bounty*, act of, in Tennessee, should be repealed, iii. 392; burdensome, 388, 390.
- State Crimes*, innocent victims of, i. 457.
- State Currency*, unconstitutionality of paper, iii. 365.
- State Legislatures*, their educational labours, i. 244; their penitentiary sys-

- tems, 245; cannot nullify a law of Congress, iii. 310.
- State Offences* almost unknown in our country, iii. 254.
- State Rights*, limits and restrictions of, iii. 308; who clamour most for, 309; only remedy for a breach of, 310; what, relinquished to the General Government, 385.
- States*, American, not sovereign and independent, iii. 313, 314; have no constitutional right to charter banks, 374.
- Statesmen*, accomplished, how made, i. 303; why so few great ones in America, iii. 313.
- Statistics* of intemperance, disclosures of, iii. 500-520.
- STEVENS, his work on Central America, iii. 166.
- STEVENSON, JAMES, iii. 12.
- Stewards*, of divine mysteries, gospel ministers, ii. 631; how they can be faithful, 643; signification of the term, 643; the duties and responsibilities of, 651.
- STEWART, REV. DANIEL, D.D., letter of, iii. 54.
- Stockholders* in banks innocent sufferers, iii. 361.
- Story*, of a German Transcendentalist, i. 14; of the American Revolution, its thrilling interest, iii. 234.
- St. Petersburg*, example of speedy growth of cities, iii. 131.
- STRABO, his testimony to the learning of the Egyptians, iii. 139.
- Stream* of civilization traced back to the Garden of Eden, i. 69, ii. 84, iii. 84.
- Strikes* of mechanics for wages unwise and injurious, iii. 597.
- Strong Drink*, fatal influence of, iii. 508.
- Structures*, massive, at Babel, disprove a savage state, iii. 108.
- Stuart Dynasty*, great principles involved in its conflicts, iii. 564.
- Students*, their future course of conduct, i. 540; privileges and responsibilities of, ii. 291; should not desire an old age of indolence, 180; of Nassau Hall, address to, 150.
- Study*, of politics the duty of American citizens, i. 287; of the Bible, what it requires, 446; of nature, its value and aims, 627-629; of arts and sciences, in the ark of Noah, iii. 104; results of antiquarian, in Egypt, 147; the true method of, gives pleasure, i. 370.
- Stump Speeches* easily turned into puritanical sermons, iii. 555.
- Subjects* proper for legislature, iii. 357.
- Submission* necessary for the Christian, ii. 260.
- Substitution*, vicarious, its necessity and wisdom, ii. 689.
- Success* no proof of divine favour, i. 175.
- Succession*, apostolic, in the prelatie sense, iii. 410.
- Successors*, of the apostles, men of great learning, ii. 45, 46; the true and legitimate, iii. 409, 444; of St. Peter, their work in the Middle Ages, 203.
- Sufferings* of man a proof of his sinfulness, ii. 504.
- SUMNER, ARCHBISHOP, his liberal sentiments, iii. 412.
- Sun and Moon* first gods of the Egyptians, iii. 142.
- Sunday-Schools*, their benefits to the poor, ii. 98, 99.
- Supremacy*, papal, when abolished in England, iii. 415.
- Supreme Court*, of the United States, interpreter of the Federal Constitution, iii. 317; final and binding, 319; proposed, instead of the General Assembly, for the church, 442, 443.
- Swindling* by bank speculators, iii. 367.
- Sword of the Spirit*, the word of God, ii. 649.
- Syllogism*, a formula of, given, ii. 678.
- Sympathy* for the drunkard, iii. 514.
- Synods and Presbyteries*, corresponding members of, iii. 454.
- System*, of salvation and virtue, in the Bible, certain and definite, iii. 198; of schools and academies, effects of, i. 136; of education at Hofwyl admirable, 95; the spirit of, unfavourable to free inquiry, iii. 191; of opinions not demanded in Scripture as an object of faith, 450; of Presbyterian church polity not held to be perfect, but the best, 439; in harmony with our civil government, 449, 450; fundamental principles of, 444.
- Systems*, various, of education, i. 65, 471, 476; of natural religion, an unsafe reliance for eternity, ii. 708, 709; of Epicurus and Lucretius degrading as to man's origin, iii. 93; utterly indefensible, 96; of philosophy, their influence on ancient Christianity, 201; diverse, among Protestants, from social and political creeds, 430.

T

- Tabernacle*, service in the Jewish, described, iii. 401.
- Tabula Rasa*, not possible to the mind of man, iii. 195.
- Tadmor*, city of the desert, how accounted for, iii. 166.
- Talents* unavailing without industry, ii. 177.
- TANAQUIL, and others, referred to, i. 99.
- Tariff*, advocates and opponents of, i. 338; controversy on, between the North and the South, 338; defined, iii. 376; the best mode of taxation, 376; for revenue and protection, 377; regarded by many

- as robbery, 378; protective, should be high, 379; not unconstitutional, 385; when sectional, unjust, 388.
- Tavern-Keepers* fall victims to intemperance, iii. 537.
- Taxation*, of land, unwise and injurious, i. 489-492; for educational purposes reasonable, 475; the basis of the public schools in Massachusetts, 473; of consumption the true principle, 494; an evil, 494; without representation, caused the American Revolution, iii. 246; a violation of the British Constitution, 246; proper objects of, 356; by a tariff on consumption equitable, 376; when the system is injurious, 391; the best system of, 566.
- Taxes*, paid by the rich, not the poor, i. 148; internal and direct, repealed by Jefferson, iii. 376.
- Teacher*, vocation of, important, i. 102; standing of, in the South and West, 425; sacred responsibilities of his office, ii. 7; how made an honourable profession, i. 80; a glorious work, 35.
- Teachers*, great mass of, adventurers, i. 103; prejudice against, 116; should be well paid, 132; essential qualifications of, 523-525; ought not to be controlled by parents, 390; great need of competent, 449; ought to be true Christians, 507; deficiencies of, 524; four classes of, iii. 272.
- Teachers of heresies*, in our times, learned and subtle, ii. 78, 79.
- TEDYUSCUNG*, the Indian chief, anecdote of, ii. 384.
- TELLUS*, and others, referred to, ii. 222.
- Temperance*, recommended to college graduates, i. 270; in eating and drinking, necessary to long life, ii. 169; advantages of, 170, 171; its great national army, iii. 515.
- Temperance Cause*, vindicated, iii. 505; objections to, answered, 511, 616; its great battle yet to be fought, 513; indebted to the medical profession, 517; its philanthropic character, 535; its origin and progress, 539; its catholic spirit, 540; its achievements, through voluntary societies, i. 271.
- Temperate Drinking*, the chief support of drunkenness, iii. 509, 517, 520, 533; sustained by the example of Christian ministers, 533.
- Temporal Penalties* insufficient to restrain men, iii. 486.
- Temptations*, incurred in party politics, i. 290; in schools and colleges, ii. 165-170; to drunkenness, iii. 508, 520.
- Tendency to savage life* in the midst of civilization, iii. 114.
- Tennessee*, consumption of liquors in, i. 182; earnest appeal for a great university in, i. 159, 161; useless legislation about schools in, 532; injurious State action on education, 647; defects in the Constitution of, iii. 296; number and expense of banks in, 374; needs a market for home products, 387; greatness of, with manufactures, 387; efforts of, at self-culture, 390; bounty act of, 391; land-tax of, bad, 392; State Temperance Society of, iii. 505; its pledge, 541; picture of climate and people of, ludicrous, 629.
- Ten Tribes of Israel*, how they lost constitutional liberty, iii. 343.
- Term*, the Presidential, of office, iii. 345.
- Terrors of death and judgment* sported with by the wicked, ii. 464.
- Testimony*, value of, as a source of knowledge, ii. 676; must be relied on, 675-677; of Scripture, on man's primitive state, iii. 112.
- Tests*, political and religious, iii. 310.
- THALES and EUDOXUS*, where they studied science, iii. 148.
- Thebes*, most ancient city on earth, according to the Egyptians, iii. 181; maximum population and architectural grandeur of, 181.
- Themes for reflection*, article on, iii. 553.
- Theological Creeds* not taught in college, i. 367.
- Theological Education*, in Europe, always in colleges, ii. 52.
- Theological Prejudices*, how formed, iii. 205.
- Theological Seminary*, the best place for developing character, ii. 51; established at Princeton, its claims, 39; on what principles founded, 39; its great object, 40; strong opposition to, at first, 53; vindicated against objectors, 57; its limited means for the first seven years, 69; referred to, iii. 16; at New Albany, 52.
- Theological Seminaries*, superior advantages of, ii. 50; needed to supply a competent ministry, 66; by whom first founded, iii. 434; of Princeton and Andover, i. 87; foundations of, in the West, ii. 27.
- Theological Systems*, their influence on the ministry, iii. 199; their proper place and use, 220; dangerous tendency of, 221.
- Theology*, a branch of study in European universities, ii. 52; the only science where God is our teacher, 654; its dogmatic study in the Middle Ages, iii. 201.
- Theories*, of Scripture interpretation stated, ii. 666; respecting the ancients, absurd, iii. 184; on the American Indians, drawn from imperfect data, 185.
- Theory*, of a primeval savage state, untenable, i. 68; of the law, its abuses and perversion, i. 299; defective one, as to

- the success of the American Revolution, iii. 241; of free trade, orthodox and beautiful, 382; practice of all nations against it, 382.
- Thoughts on Slavery in America*, iii. 663.
- Three Parties on the American common-school system*, i. 648.
- THURLLOW, LORD, remark of, i. 271.
- TILLOTSON, and other Episcopal dignitaries, liberality of, iii. 411.
- Timæus and Critias*, of Plato, thought to refer to America, iii. 156.
- Time*, often wasted in schools and colleges, i. 520; amount of, usefully employed, ii. 160; improvement of, a sermon, 205; rapid flight of, 207; waste of, 210; true estimate of, 212; an estate, our all, 214; how abused by the multitude, 215; more precious than wealth, 221; a talent specially committed to the young, 238; present, nothing in the light of eternity, 697; given to prepare for heaven, 707; its priceless value illustrated, iii. 643; with culture, essential to all great attainments, 82; of regeneration, not always known to Christians, ii. 395, 396.
- TIMOTHY AND TITUS, evangelists, iii. 409.
- Titles*, of honour, greatly prized in our country, i. 214; of nobility, contrary to the Constitution, iii. 340; of bishops in the United States, their import, 417.
- Tobacco*, use of, condemned, iii. 623; Western parsons addicted to, 624.
- Toleration*, a term unknown to our laws, i. 318, iii. 423.
- TOPLADY, his opinion and practice on religious controversy, iii. 211.
- Total Abstinence*, commended by many physicians, iii. 516; the main power of the temperance cause, 529; only remedy for drunkenness, 534.
- Total Depravity*, the doctrine clearly taught in Scripture, ii. 498, 685; virtually admitted by all, 687.
- Tradesmen* need associations for literature and culture, i. 123.
- Traffic* in ardent spirits, unlawful, iii. 535; wicked and ruinous to all concerned, 536.
- Training*, of children, an absolute and universal law, iii. 484; never fails when complied with, 484; of the faculties, the great end of college studies, i. 110.
- Traitors* to democracy, iii. 310.
- Transubstantiation*, Romish doctrine of, contrary to reason, ii. 668; its absurdity illustrated, 669.
- Transylvania University* referred to, i. 87.
- Treasury*, its Secretary dependent on the President, iii. 323.
- Trial* by jury bad in theory, good in practice, iii. 557.
- Tribes*, aboriginal American, a distinct variety of the human race, iii. 165; under the same destiny and curse, 166.
- Tribunals*, of the Presbyterian Church, their functions, iii. 440; separate judicial, suggested, 442.
- Tribute*, honourable, to the medical profession, iii. 517.
- Trickery and Mystification* not found in the Bible, ii. 667.
- Tricks* of genteel beggars disguised as foreigners, iii. 607.
- Trinitarians*, their views of Unitarianism, ii. 77, 78.
- Trinity* of the Godhead, its place in revealed religion, ii. 638; nature of the doctrine, 640; a mysterious fact, 674; to be received on divine testimony, 675.
- Triumph* of the temperance reformation, iii. 513.
- TROOST, DR. GERARD, Professor in the Nashville University, i. 34, iii. 52; his mineralogical cabinet, i. 268; address of Dr. Lindsley, on his life and character, 593; born and educated in Holland, 597; his doctorate, 599; pupil of Haüy, 599; honourable appointments in Europe, 600; becomes an American citizen, 600; his residence in Philadelphia, 601; State geologist of Tennessee, 602; success as professor of natural science, 604; character as a philosopher, 605; his scientific pursuits, 606; his writings, 607; his reputation abroad, 608; abhorrence of sciolism and quackery, 609; cabinet and library of, 613; his private life and virtues, 615; gentlemanly bearing, 616; his punctilious honesty, 617; estimate of his philosophical genius, 617; a self-made man, 618; a good man, 620; anecdote of him as a peacemaker, 621; his religion, 621; his contented spirit, 622-625; his surviving children, 626; his classical scholarship, 632; testimonials of his character and learning, 635-638.
- True Faith*, how manifested, ii. 681.
- True Religion*, its blessings forfeited unless diffused, iii. 480.
- True Riches* preferable to wealth, i. 459.
- True Virtue* derived only from God, ii. 132.
- True Wisdom* for time and eternity, a sermon on, ii. 157.
- Truth*, progress of moral, i. 180; every kind of, courts investigation, 282; relative value of different kinds of, 286; mental condition for acquiring, iii. 196; religious, must be preached in its just proportions, ii. 22.
- Truths*, of the gospel, fatal effects of suppressing, ii. 650; of natural science, useless to us after death, 654.
- Tuckahoe*, vindication of Western learning, iii. 638.

TUCKER, his biography of Jefferson referred to, iii. 334, 350, 376.
 TURGOT, origin of his inscription on Franklin, iii. 36.
Two-Thirds, vote of, when a proper rule, iii. 344, 345.
 TYLER, JOHN, President, his bank-vetoes, iii. 369.
Tyranny, of fashion, its bondage, i. 186; to be resisted by the young, 201; political, under a democracy, iii. 312; inconsistent with the gospel, 489; British, never in fact extended over this country, 244.

U

Ulster, temperance society of, illustration of a catholic spirit, iii. 540.
Ultimate Facts believed without understanding their nature, ii. 676.
Ultraism, American, of every kind, i. 468; of the pro-slavery party, iii. 557.
Unbelief, a grievous sin, ii. 620; grounds of, with ungodly men, futile, 426.
Uncharitable Controversies condemned by Scripture, iii. 209.
Undergraduates, studies of, i. 103; of English and American universities, 400.
Understanding essential to belief, ii. 673, 679.
Unfaithful Ministers no argument against the good, ii. 65.
Unfulfilled Prophecies to be left to future generations, ii. 669.
Ungodly Youth, their downward career in life, i. 542-544.
Unhallowed Ambition, the young counselled against, i. 178.
Uninspired Writers misrepresent man's nature, ii. 245.
Union, of the American States, must be maintained, i. 352; the watchword of patriotism, 354; its expansion unlimited, 583; may be dissolved, iii. 255; equality of privileges in, 386; should be indissoluble and perpetual, 385; of church and state contrary to the gospel, ii. 319; existence of, in the fourth century, iii. 520, 553; true Christian, exemplified in the Bible Society, 501; the strength of the temperance reform, 510, 512; of church and state, fatal to civil and religious liberty, 416; history of, worthy to be studied, 420; how effected under Constantine, 421, 453; first severed in the American colonies by their national independence, 422.
Unitarianism a dangerous subversion of the gospel, ii. 77, 78.
Unitarians, cannot be fellow-Christians with Trinitarians, ii. 77; attack the argument for an infinite atonement, 691.
United Brethren, their missionary labours, ii. 433, 434.

United States of America, our right to the name, i. 578, 579; preference over other creditors, iii. 320; only country where religion is free from state interference, 422; bank of, its constitutionality, 335, 337; character of its paper, 371; number of banks in, 374; could produce enough to feed the British Empire, 381; too dependent on England for manufactures, 385; essential unity of, 385; internal and domestic commerce of, 387; need a market for the products of home industry, 381-387; first and second bank of, 547.

Unity, one of the three great principles of Presbyterian polity, iii. 404; of the human race, Scripture text on, 574, 576.

Universal Charity personified and commended, iii. 225.

Universal Education, the only practicable theory of, i. 500.

Universal Reading not good for the mind, i. 281.

Universal Salvation a false and fatal doctrine, ii. 491.

Universal Warfare, its effect on human improvement, iii. 238.

University, personal objections to, considered, i. 375; the poor man's friend, 396; what is designated by the term, 399; its beau-ideal nowhere yet realized, 400; state or national, as a means of instruction, 407; adds to the prosperity of a city, 428; collects a literary society, 430; general benefits arising from, 433; first planted in the Garden of Eden, 434; the friend of common schools, 448; central sun of all school systems, 504; its history traced through past ages, 505; of Geneva, outline of its course of study, i. 413-415; of Georgia, described, 217; of Oxford, indebted to the wisdom of King Alfred, 85; of Nashville, purpose of its founders, 218; its choice position, 219; its cause eloquently pleaded, 153-158; its services to Tennessee, 364; its highest eulogium, 365; its freedom from sectarian influence, 366; its hopes for the future, 368; speech in behalf of, 375; its history and prospects, 535, 536; its bereavements, 593; its superior advantages, 605; a new plan proposed for, iii. 50, 51; its successes, 52; its high claims vindicated, 637; its admirable location and apparatus, 605; of New York, professorships in, i. 419, 420; of Pennsylvania, its obligations to Franklin, i. 141; of Virginia, amount expended on, 135; Jefferson's efforts in behalf of, 142; its professors and system of instruction, 418, 419.

University Education, views of, in Tennessee, i. 20-23; vindication of, for the people, 25, 26; its history in ancient and modern times, 343; its abuses and

- perversions, 397; obligations of the world to, 433; ancient and modern, 434, 435; influences felt, even where no universities exist, 436; beneficial effects on nations, 451-453; agency in the American Revolution, 454; demands legislative aid, 506; system of, in Continental Europe, 401; advantages of, to the poor, 394; extensive effects of, 436.
- Universities*, needed to sustain primary schools, i. 38, 39; none in the world yet complete, 406; of Europe mostly located in large cities, 239, 258; of Scotland and New England, 79; of the Netherlands, 242; of Germany and the Continent, 243, 402; do not prevent surrounding ignorance, iii. 134; of the Nile and Euphrates, their graduates, 134.
- Unpopular Minister* in the British Parliament, why he must resign, iii. 328.
- Upstart Nobility*, their impositions, iii. 266, 267.
- Urgent Calls* to repentance, ii. 626.
- Use*, of conscience in man, ii. 664; of wine as a beverage, iii. 59.
- USHER, ARCHBISHOP, on early population, iii. 117.
- Usurpations* of the President of the United States, iii. 341.
- Usury Laws* vexatious and nugatory, iii. 357.
- Utilitarian Views*, of education, i. 226; of dogmatists, 483.
- Utility*, of all knowledge contended for, ii. 240; of colleges, i. 346.
- V
- Valedictory* of Washington a priceless legacy to his country, iii. 230.
- Validity*, of baptism, as held by Presbyterians, ii. 340; of orders and ordinances in churches, iii. 454.
- VAN BUREN, MARTIN, President, quoted, iii. 275, 283.
- VANINI, the atheist, his tribute to Christianity, iii. 472.
- VAN RENSSELAER, DR. CORTLANDT, his address at Dr. Lindsley's funeral, iii. 76.
- Vantage-Ground*, American, over the English, iii. 231.
- Varieties* of man, not caused by climate or food, iii. 175; not traceable to any historic origin, 175.
- Variety* of the human family, none new within the historic period, iii. 174.
- Vast Patronage* of the President of the United States, iii. 348.
- VATTEL, and other writers on political economy, ii. 418.
- Vegetation*, mysterious as the resurrection of the dead, ii. 671; used by Paul for illustration, 673.
- Vendor* of ardent spirits, how enriched, iii. 525; cannot ask God's blessing on his work, 539.
- Veteran Lawyers*, their opinion of the law, i. 297.
- Veto Power*, the Presidential, not often resorted to, iii. 343; ought to be abolished, 344; a royal prerogative borrowed from England, 347; exercised by President Tyler, 369; of farmers and mechanics, 346; the Roman, did no good, 346.
- Vicarious Substitution* a doctrine of Scripture, ii. 689.
- Vice*, the characteristic of the present age, i. 114; shortens life, ii. 163; its mastery over the young, 171; powerful tendency to, 285; of drunkenness, denounced in Scripture, iii. 531.
- Victims* of intemperance, iii. 520.
- Victory* of the Christian over sin, ii. 682.
- Vindication*, of the clergy as a useful profession, ii. 62, 63; good work and aims of, 64; of the temperance cause, iii. 505; of university education, i. 25.
- Views* on denominational schools and colleges, i. 256.
- Vine-Culture* in our country, suggestions on, iii. 530.
- Violations*, of law, not allowable in Christians, ii. 321; of the Federal Constitution, iii. 340.
- VIRGIL, quotations from, i. 71, ii. 240.
- Virginia*, colleges of, i. 216; schools of, 480; religious destitution in, formerly, ii. 714.
- Virtue*, import of, ii. 131; as understood by those who substitute it for religion, 134; in what true, consists, i. 175; with intelligence, our national bulwark, 345; on what it depends, 271.
- Visionary Schemes*, of education for the people, i. 499; of reformation depicted, iii. 483.
- Vitality*, animal and vegetable, a mystery, ii. 672.
- Vocation* of the teacher, its importance, i. 102.
- VOLNEY, and others of the infidel school, i. 447.
- VOLTAIRE, a warning to young men, ii. 152; a lover of worldly pleasure, ii. 263; referred to, iii. 496.
- Voluntary Association*, power and aims of, iii. 528, 541.
- Voluntary System* of education advocated, i. 515.
- Volunteer Militia*, expense of, iii. 598.
- Voluptuary* exhorted to reformation, ii. 175.
- Voting*, for what kind of men, iii. 283.
- Vulgar Prejudices*, all men influenced by, iii. 191; when good and salutary, 192.
- Vulgarisms* in spelling instanced, iii. 639.

W

- WAKE, ARCHBISHOP, his liberal opinions cited, iii. 411, 412.
- Waldenses referred to, iii. 430.
- Want, of charity often exhibited in the pulpit, i. 321; of union among early Protestant sects, iii. 462.
- War, not the true policy of America, i. 354; contrary to the spirit of Christianity, ii. 323, 324; will cease only as Bible principles prevail, iii. 491; of our Revolution just and necessary, 246.
- WARBURTON, BISHOP, on the civilization of ancient Egypt, iii. 137; a system-builder, 142.
- Warnings, solemn, to the impenitent, ii. 410, 623; of Washington against sectional divisions, iii. 256, 258.
- WASHINGTON, GEORGE, his example as a farmer, i. 124; his liberal efforts for education, 142; his views of colleges, 238; his Farewell Address quoted, 579; referred to, with Roger Williams, ii. 418; celebration of his centennial birthday, iii. 229; effect of the tidings of his death described, 234; raised up by the Almighty for a great occasion, 249; his place filled by no other man, 250; his extraordinary moderation and clemency, 251; a framer and the first administrator of our form of government, 252; his last cautions against sectionalism, 256; remedy for this evil, 257; belonged not to America, but the world, 258; his life a study for all classes, 259; industry and independence of, 260; secret of his exaltation, 261; perfection of his character, 258-260; called by Byron Cincinnati of the West, 262; great simply as a man, 262; incidents in his life, 61; why elected President, 276; head of his cabinet, 327; his financial policy, 334; his policy the true American one, 346.
- Water changed into wine, the first miracle, ii. 670, 671.
- WATT and FULTON, inventors, ii. 417.
- Way of salvation pointed out, ii. 720.
- Wealth, universal passion for, condemned, i. 459; not the criterion of happiness, ii. 223; how created and perpetuated in nations, iii. 387; acquisition of, not condemned in the Bible, 589.
- Wealthy Classes, few literary men among, i. 394.
- Weather, an article on, iii. 626.
- WEBSTER, DANIEL, his Union sentiments adopted, i. 356.
- WEBSTER, NOAH, his orthography and orthoepy, iii. 642.
- WELLINGTON, LORD, referred to, ii. 679.
- WENTWORTH, and other bad examples, i. 335.
- WERNER and HAUY referred to, ii. 418.
- WESLEY, JOHN, his liberality of opinion, iii. 207.
- WESSELING, quoted on the knowledge of America, iii. 171.
- West Indies, the ruins of an ancient continent, iii. 159.
- Western Colleges, number and standing of, i. 212.
- Western Institutions, an evil in, i. 388; theological, note respecting, ii. 27.
- Western States, their destitution of the Bible, iii. 466.
- Westminster Assembly, its constituent members, iii. 431, 432.
- WHATELY, ARCHBISHOP, on the Trinity, ii. 675; logic of, referred to, 676; opinion of apostolic succession, iii. 410; a low-church Episcopalian, 446.
- Wheat and Tares found in the apostolic church, iii. 405.
- Whig and Democrat, popular meaning of the terms, iii. 275; the right kind of, 315; their claims, 331.
- Whigs of the Revolution, their character, i. 212.
- Whisky, not needed by soldiers in camp or battle, iii. 527; its bondage broken by temperance reform, 528; the trade in, compared to the slave-trade, 523; a dead loss of capital, 524; demagogues who treat in, 495.
- Whistle, article on, iii. 602.
- WHITE, BISHOP, his modesty, iii. 419.
- WHITEFIELD, GEORGE, a model missionary, ii. 73; an example of decision of character, 254.
- WHITGIFT, ARCHBISHOP, his views on church government, iii. 414; a fierce persecutor, 415.
- WHITNEY and the cotton-gin, ii. 418; instance of a self-made man, i. 341.
- Who best entitled to God's blessings, ii. 193.
- Wholesale Abuse of Presbyterian clergymen, instance of, ii. 355.
- Wicked Men, cannot reject a divine providence, ii. 462; honest at the approach of death, 463; eternal punishment of, 492.
- WICKLIFFE, JOHN, and other victims of priestly tyranny, i. 284; referred to, with other Reformers, ii. 46; a great light of the university in his day, i. 444.
- Widows, should have precedence in claims, iii. 321; and orphans made by intemperance, 520, 580.
- WILBERFORCE, and other philanthropists, ii. 135.
- Wild Man compared with wild animals, i. 128.
- WILKES, JOHN, referred to, i. 266; his remark on hanging a man, iii. 556.
- Will, of God, no appeal from, ii. 104; freedom of, in man, 675.
- William and Mary, the College of, i. 216.

- WILLIAMS, ROGER, iii. 293.
Wilmot Proviso and Missouri Compromise unconstitutional, iii. 571.
Wine, as a beverage, iii. 529; bearing on temperance reform, 530; temperate use of, not prohibited in Scripture, 531; not to be used when it gives offence, 532.
Wines, light, of Southern Europe, a substitute for whisky, iii. 530; manufacture of, suggested for our country, 530; of traffic, much adulterated, 530.
Wisdom, its great life-lessons, ii. 186; defined, 187; the scheme of life required by, 159; benefits to be derived from, 200; of the ancient Egyptians, import of, iii. 148.
Wisest Men of antiquity destitute of true spiritual light, ii. 420.
WITHERSPOON, DR. JOHN, referred to, ii. 47.
WOLSEY, CARDINAL, embodied in many a popular saint, iii. 497.
WOLSTENHOLME, SIR JOHN, referred to, iii. 438.
Woman, a slave in nations without the Bible, iii. 468; only by the gospel raised to the proper rank, 469, 490; must ever feel for her suffering sex, 471; her wrongs and injuries under existing human laws, 490; loss of, by the United States Bank, 547.
Word of God always appeals to reason, ii. 667.
Words and Phrases in the mouth of devout people, ii. 675, 682.
Work of redemption, a systematic one, ii. 644; of God in nature gives no indication of redemption, 638; of a gospel minister, its nature and extent, 656.
Working Men, privileges and duties of, i. 302; their interests, iii. 270.
World, condition of, without a Sabbath, ii. 108; large portion of, yet to be Christianized, 80; an ample field for all the efforts of good men, i. 179; supposed to be growing wiser, ii. 415; compared to ancient Sodom, 473; with sin in it, a great mystery, 674; present, estimated by eternity, 707; has produced but one Washington, iii. 261; population of the antediluvian, 100; governed too much, 354; a paradise if all men lived by the Bible, 483; its abounding wretchedness and woe, 489.
Worship, Christian and Jewish, contrasted, iii. 401; of different churches, attendance on, 454; of the New Testament, ii. 339.
Worst Heresy, uncharitableness, i. 323.
Would-be Popes, their sectarianism repudiated, i. 366.
Writers, on longevity, what they recommend, ii. 169; of Scripture, worthy of credit as historians, 669.
Writing, not unknown to the antediluvians, iii. 101.
- Writings* of Dr. Lindsley, manuscript and published, i. 32, 33.
Written Creeds, necessity for, ii. 341.
Wytttenbach, and others, referred to, i. 390.
- Y
- Yale College*, its rank, i. 87; early trials of, 210; influence in the Revolutionary War, 211; choir of professors and tutors, 416, 417.
Yankee Character, specimen of, i. 508, 510; great shrewdness of, iii. 651.
YATES, ROBERT, his notes on the National Convention, iii. 317.
Year, lessons from the close of, ii. 207.
Yoke of whisky despotism, how broken, iii. 528.
YOUNG, DR. EDWARD, his *Night Thoughts* quoted, ii. 233.
Young Men, diligence in study urged upon, i. 162-166; exposed to vices in college, ii. 165; not fit to be intrusted with legislation, iii. 284.
Young Minds, responsibility of instructing, i. 117; to be trained on Bible principles, iii. 484.
Young Preachers, their tendency to choose difficult themes, ii. 357.
Youth, must be constantly employed in education, i. 45; effeminate character of college-bred, 91; American, their imperfect discipline in schools, 115; of the poor, must depend on home colleges, 145; in college, whence their bad habits, 259; in Eastern colleges, temptations of, 260; the proper government of, 369; in cities, how ruined, 382; advice to, 544; to be trained for teachers, 449; reasoned with to embrace religion, ii. 20, 21; favoured season for good impressions, 137, 138; solemn appeal to, 140-143; their sacred responsibilities, 145, 146; temptations of, 146; strong tendency to folly, 167; their contempt of study, 178; warnings to, 291; time to gain useful knowledge, 239; urged to acquire every species of useful knowledge, 241; most gifted, fall victims to intemperance, iii. 520; their progress on the downward road, 521; exposed by society to infamy, 536; in colleges, exposed to drunkenness, 521; thousands saved by the temperance reformation, 528.
- ZACCHEUS, his example instructive, ii. 320.
Zeal, of party sects, about schools and colleges, i. 254-257; in preaching, not a test of piety or charity, ii. 362.
Zoology easily studied by Noah's family in the Ark, iii. 104.
ZOROASTER, his system powerless, ii. 650.
ZUINGLIUS, and other Reformers, not free from a persecuting spirit, ii. 315, iii. 430.



